

The Modern Language Journal

Volume XL

OCTOBER, 1956

Number 6

Contents

THE MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES: A CHRONICLE OF ACHIEVEMENT, <i>Henry Grattan Doyle</i>	269
ON TEACHING A FOREIGN CULTURE, <i>Howard Lee Nostrand</i>	297
THE ROLE OF THE MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN OUR SCHOOLS, <i>Vincenzo Cioffari</i>	302
FERDINAND DE SAUSSURE—FORERUNNER OF MODERN STRUCTURALISM, <i>John T. Waterman</i>	307
TESTING THE LANGUAGE ARTS, <i>Earle G. Eley</i>	310
"CATHAY AND THE WAY THITHER": ORIENTAL LITERATURE IN THE WORLD LITERATURE PROGRAM, <i>G. L. Anderson</i>	316
A BRIEF CLASSIFICATION OF THE LIMITS OF TRANSLATABILITY, <i>Robert L. Politzer</i>	319
THE NEED FOR LANGUAGE STUDY IN AMERICA TODAY, <i>Henri Peyre</i>	323
LANGUAGE ANALYSIS AND LANGUAGE TEACHING, <i>Archibald A. Hill</i>	335
FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING IN EUROPE, <i>Ernest E. Ellert and Lois V. Ellert</i>	346
THE STORY OF A STAMP: A LESSON IN INTERCULTURE, <i>Louis Foley</i>	351
NOTES AND NEWS	354
BOOK REVIEWS	361

(An index for the periodical year is published annually. From its inception in 1929, *The Educational Index* covers the subject-matter of the MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL.)

Published by
The National Federation of Modern
Language Teachers Associations

The Modern Language Journal

STAFF, 1956

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

(Former Managing Editors)

- | | |
|---|--|
| BAYARD QUINCY MORGAN, Stanford University, California (1926-30). | EDWIN H. ZEYDEL, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio (1938-43). |
| CHARLES H. HOLZWARTH, University of Texas, Austin, Texas (1930-34). | HENRI C. OLINGER, New York University, New York, N. Y. (1944-46). |
| HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE, The George Washington University, Washington, D. C. (1934-38). | JULIO DEL TORO, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (1948-1954) |

MANAGING EDITOR

CAMILLO P. MERLINO, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts

ASSISTANT TO THE MANAGING EDITOR

HERBERT H. GOLDEN, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts

ASSISTANT MANAGING EDITORS

(Review and Department Editors)

- | | |
|---|---|
| AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS—José Sánchez, University of Illinois, Chicago, Ill. | LINGUISTICS—Mario Pei, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. |
| ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS—Stephen L. Pitcher, St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis, Mo. | METHODOLOGY—Evelyn Van Eenenaam, Eastern High School, Detroit, Mich. |
| FRENCH—Cameron C. Gullette, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. | PERSONALIA—William Marion Miller, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. |
| GERMAN—J. Alan Pfeffer, The University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y. | PORTUGUESE—D. Lee Hamilton, Qrts. 26, Presidio of Monterey, California. |
| HEBREW—Abraham I. Katsh, New York University, New York, N. Y. | RUSSIAN—Mischa Fayer, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont. |
| ITALIAN—D. Vittorini, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. | SPANISH—Robert Avrett, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn. |

(Survey Editors)

- | | |
|---|---|
| FRENCH—Cortland Eyer, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa. | PORTUGUESE—Gerald Moser, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa. |
| GERMAN—Victor Lange, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. | SPANISH AND SPANISH AMERICAN—Julio del Toro, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. |
| ITALIAN—O. A. Bontempo, College of the City of New York. | |

BUSINESS MANAGER

STEPHEN L. PITCHER, 7144 Washington Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

NOTE—The printed order of articles does not imply relative merit. Opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the editorial staff. The interest and the cooperation of all *Journal* contributors are appreciated.

All contributions should conform to the directions contained in the MLA Style Sheet. Unacceptable manuscripts accompanied by postage will be returned.

The Modern Foreign Languages: A Chronicle of Achievement

IN 1941 *The Modern Language Journal* published a "Jubilee Issue", ably edited by Professor Edwin H. Zeydel, then Managing Editor, in observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the *Journal*. Nearly thirty pages of that number were devoted to articles by a "galaxy" of persons active in the founding and development of the Federation and the *Journal*. These contributors were William B. Snow, Adolf Busse, Charles H. Hand-schin, E. W. Bagster-Collins, Bayard Q. Morgan, Charles H. Holzwarth, Henry Grattan Doyle, and Stephen L. Pitcher. Their articles, combining the factual, the personal, and the reminiscent, still make interesting reading. They were followed by messages of congratulation, far from perfunctory in tone, from the then United States Commissioner of Education, John W. Studebaker; the President of the American Council on Education, George F. Zook; the Chief of the Division of Cultural Relations of the Department of State, Charles A. Thomson; the presidents of three great universities, several superintendents of schools, and others.

Re-reading this issue of the *Journal* has been a moving experience for me, not only because it recalls so many friends now gone, but because it emphasizes again how much the modern foreign language teachers of the United States owe to "so many," rather than to so few. No individual, or group of individuals, or little coterie of any kind, living or dead, has done any more than many, many others to bring about the progress that has been made in the last century and a half. Thousands of individuals have made contributions to this work, as members and officers of associations, as contributors to professional journals, as researchers on methods and materials, as testers and test-makers, and—last but not least—as ordinary classroom teachers in schools of varied types, in colleges equally varied in character, in teacher-

training institutions, and in public and private universities. In the great "Modern Foreign Language Study" of 1924-28, for instance, more than a hundred persons served on national or regional committees and thousands of others cooperated by answering questionnaires, discussing aims, objectives, methods and materials at numerous meetings, or by checking many pages of textual materials for the frequency-counts of vocabulary, idioms, and syntax that were a noteworthy achievement of the "Study" and that have had a marked effect on the preparation of foreign language textbooks and related materials, and in other ways.

In all this effort the associations that constitute The National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations, and the Federation itself, operating through its own committees, in cooperation with other organizations or through *The Modern Language Journal*, have played an important rôle, in which all concerned may take legitimate pride.

How and why was the Federation formed? What have been its activities and achievements during the past forty years? How has it cooperated with other organizations in the interests of more and better teaching of modern foreign languages in the United States? At the risk of repeating facts already known, at least in part, to many readers of the *Journal*, let me attempt to sketch (1) a few milestones in the history of modern foreign language teaching in the United States, (2) the steps leading to the foundation of the National Federation itself, and (3) the widespread activities of the *Journal* and the Federation, and of those affiliated with them, for the past forty years.

SOME MILESTONES IN THE TEACHING OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN THE UNITED STATES

As one reads the story of the past, both in Europe and in America, with an eye to the

development of the difficult and varied arts that make a successful modern foreign language teacher—say in Bagster-Collins, or Handschin, or Buchanan and MacPhee, or Hagboldt¹—one is struck by the realization that almost everything we think of as modern, “up-to-date,” even novel, in foreign language teaching, was known and practiced long ago, indeed centuries ago; and nearly every “advanced” theory of the present day was expressed—sometimes better expressed—by scholars and teachers long dead. “How old the new!” one cannot help but exclaim, on reading Montaigne, or Ascham, or Milton, or Locke, or Comenius! They, and other writers of centuries ago, knew about the oral approach; about the value of conversational practice with “native” speakers; about the use of visual aids; about the importance of repetition and “over-learning”; about adapting methods to the intelligence, experience, and age-levels of pupils; about the advantages of beginning a foreign language in childhood and keeping it up *continuously* for a long period; about the importance of both the “practical” aim and the literary aim. Our own Ticknor, at Harvard a century and a quarter ago, even “sectioned for ability,” and promoted students “without fuss and feathers” to higher classes on the basis of their demonstrated proficiency, rather than by the satisfaction of time-serving requirements alone.

Coming nearer to the present, recent reports on the training of modern foreign language teachers add little to what we have known for decades. I have in mind particularly an excellent report made to the Wisconsin Association of Modern Foreign Language Teachers in November, 1927 by a committee headed by Charles M. Purin, and Purin's exhaustive volume on *The Training of Teachers of the Modern Foreign Languages* (vol. XIII of the publications of The Modern Foreign Language Study). Parenthetically, it all too often seems that our profession has forgotten not only the substance of the professional contributions of leaders like A. Marshall Elliott, Charles H. Grandgent, Calvin Thomas, William B. Snow, Starr W. Cutting, Edward S. Joynes, W. T. Hewett, E. H. Bab-bitt, Alexander R. Hohlfeld, Marian P. Whitney, Lawrence A. Wilkins, Frederick B. Luquens, E. W. Bagster-Collins, J. P. W. Craw-

ford, Algernon Coleman, Louis A. Roux, Milton A. Buchanan, and many others, but even their very names. The authors or compilers of the seventeen volumes of The Modern Foreign Language Study should be enshrined in a “Modern Foreign Language Hall of Fame,” along with Ticknor, and Longfellow, and Lowell; and with Robert Herndon Fife, and Hayward Keniston, and Bayard Quincy Morgan, all of whom are still happily working among us in fruitful retirement, in prominent places.

The name of Morgan recalls another instance in which we seem likely to forget that everything “new” is really not so new at all. The recent revival of interest in the teaching of modern foreign languages in the elementary schools—thanks to the bold educational statesmanship of a U. S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. Earl J. McGrath—sometimes makes languages in the elementary schools seem to be the “brainchild” of newcomers to the field who appear to have seized upon it as a Pegasus on which to ride to fame (or at least to publicity). Yet languages in elementary schools are an old story, as we have documentation from Handschin and others¹ to attest. It was largely the excited reaction of the World War I era against all things German, from which Meissen china, German music, Vienna sausage, and even sauerkraut (re-named “Liberty cabbage”) did not escape, that eliminated language teaching from the elementary schools. (Fortunately this hysteria was not so prevalent in World War II.) As early as 1938, B. Q. Morgan was pleading for re-introduction of languages in the elementary schools, in an article in the *Sierra Educational News* (reprinted in the last issue of *The Modern Language Journal* under my editorship, May, 1938, page 369). In the “forties” Ruth Mays, W. C. Zellars, and Emilie Margaret White, and many others—including the great State of Texas itself!—were striving to re-establish foreign languages in the elementary schools, and in some cases, for instance in San Diego and for a time in Washington, D.C., succeeding. “How old the new!”

Now for milestones. First and foremost, with due respect to other pioneering institutions, was the foundation in 1816 of the “Smith

¹ See bibliographical note, page 295.

Professorship of the French and Spanish Languages and Literatures" (and of "Belles-Lettres") in Harvard College, a post that George Ticknor actively assumed in 1819. Ticknor occupied the chair until 1835, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow from 1836 to 1854, James Russell Lowell from 1854 to 1891 (from 1886 as Emeritus Professor) and J. D. M. Ford from 1907 on (now Emeritus Professor).¹ There is a good brief summary of Ticknor's ideas on foreign language teaching in the indispensable Newmark: *Twentieth Century Modern Language Teaching: Sources and Readings*,¹ based on my sketch of Ticknor; while Longfellow's career as a professor is admirably brought upon the scene in Carl Johnson's *Longfellow of Harvard*.¹ Lowell's presidential address before The Modern Language Association of America in 1890 is of course a high-point in the history of that admirable organization.

The foundation of The Modern Language Association of America in 1883, in fact, is the next milestone in the history of our studies. For it we are indebted to A. Marshall Elliott, the moving spirit in the establishment of "MLA". To its foundation we owe the acceptance of modern languages and literatures as subjects entitled to rank with the Classics as fit subjects to occupy the minds of college students. Though the long struggle was not ended, as Luedke has pointed out in his absorbing article,² success came at last, and the efforts, sometimes despairing, of Ticknor, Longfellow, Lowell, and others, with strong aid from Charles Francis Adams and Charles W. Eliot, proved to be not in vain.

For many years the Modern Language Association made pedagogical sessions a regular part of its annual meetings, and committees on the conditions attending foreign language teaching were active from 1884 on. The National Education Association—strangely enough in view of later periods in the history of that organization, when narrow "educationists" supplanted broad-gauge educators like Eliot, Barnard, Butler, Winship and other "old-timers" in its activities—became interested in the problems of foreign language teaching along with other subject-matter fields, and papers dealing with foreign languages appeared from time to time in its *Proceedings*. In 1892 the

"NEA" began a survey of the curriculum, with nine conferences devoted to the respective subjects. The report of the Conference on Modern Languages, known as the *Report of the Committee of Ten*, submitted by Charles H. Grandgent, its chairman, was published in 1893 by the U. S. Office of Education.³

The next milestone was the famous *Report of the Committee of Twelve*, sponsored in 1897 by The Modern Language Association of America at the request of The National Education Association. The chairman was Calvin Thomas, and among its members were Elliott, Grandgent, Cutting, Hugo A. Rennert, B. W. Wells, and William B. Snow. Its report was accepted by the "MLA" in 1898 and by the "NEA" in 1899, and it was published in book form by D. C. Heath and Company in 1901—one of the first of this firm's many contributions to our profession.⁴

The *Report of the Committee of Twelve* was a work of efficiency and practical good sense. Letters were sent to 2500 school and college teachers, not only asking information as to prevailing conditions, but seeking to learn their attitudes on various "debatable questions." The final report contains sections on the value of modern foreign languages in secondary education; a "critical review" of various methods of teaching ("grammar method", "natural

² Otto K. Luedke: "A Historical Review of the Controversy between the Ancient and the Modern Languages" in *The German Quarterly*, January, 1944.

³ It is summarized in *The Modern Language Forum* for April, 1926 (Los Angeles: Modern Language Association of Southern California).

⁴ Heath had published in 1892 a volume on *Methods of Teaching Modern Languages*, a series of "papers on the value and on the methods of modern language instruction," the authors including some of those mentioned above. A revised edition, published in 1915, included a "Statement" of the Chairman of the Committee on Modern Languages, National Education Association, namely William B. Snow of the English High School, Boston (later Assistant Superintendent of the Boston Public Schools), to whom modern foreign language teachers owe so much, not only as a teacher and writer on modern foreign language teaching, but because of his leadership in the foundation of The New England Modern Language Association, and because of his early support of *The Modern Language Journal* and of The National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations, of which he was the first president. His "Statement" was made at the annual meeting of the "NEA" in July, 1914.

method," "psychological method," "phonetic method," "reading method"); sections on "method as related to the training of teachers"; on modern foreign languages below the high school; and specific proposed courses of study for German and French on three levels: elementary, intermediate, and advanced, including suggestions as to suitable texts. Specimen examination papers for admission to college are also included.

The *Report of the Committee of Twelve* was the most thorough and significant contribution to the literature of our field until the publication of the various reports of The Modern Foreign Language Study more than a quarter of a century later. In the words of the "Report of the Committee on Modern Foreign Languages of the NEA Commission on the Curriculum" made in 1926, with William B. Snow as chairman and a membership that included among others Charles H. Handschin, William R. Price, and E. B. de Sauzé, the *Report of the Committee of Twelve* was "still the basic authority on the teaching of modern foreign languages."⁵

Another milestone in the period between the *Report of the Committee of Twelve* and the foundation of *The Modern Language Journal* was the publication of the *Report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature*, composed of representatives of the NEA, the MLA, and The American Philological Association.⁶ This is, to me at least, a sound document, seeking to clean out the Augean stables of grammatical terminology. I have never been able to understand why some of its suggestions, such as "narrative past" for "preterite," "past definite," etc.; "descriptive past" for "imperfect"; and "past future" for the ambiguous "conditional" (tense), have not been more generally adopted.

The foundation of *The Modern Language Journal* and of The National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations are next in order, but they will be passed over for later treatment.

The next milestone, The Modern Language Study, was in part the result of the foundation of *The Modern Language Journal* and the formation of The National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations, which demonstrated (1) that all teachers of modern foreign

languages, from the elementary schools to colleges and universities, had a common purpose, a common responsibility, and (2) that scholars who had made reputations in research, philological or literary, could also make contributions to the "practical" problems of the craft, to methodology and materials, to the formulation of appropriate standards for various levels, and—most important—to the preparation of teachers, which was (and is) the major problem of the profession.

I say "in part," because although the *Report of the Committee of Twelve*, in the words of Robert Herndon Fife, Chairman of The Modern Foreign Language Study,⁷ "became a classic for the following generation of modern language teachers" and "in content and even in wording was taken over into school syllabi and college announcements and the requirements of standardizing agencies like the College Entrance Board," a "change had appeared in the secondary schools which was to undermine the convention that the school curriculum was part of the college curriculum." This change, of course, resulted from the great increase in high-school enrollments, the more varied economic and social backgrounds from which high-school pupils now came, and the development of vocational and semi-vocational subjects. "After 1918," adds Fife, "educationists, under the stress of public opinion, set out on a frantic search for the social objectives which might justify the presence of subjects on the secondary-school curriculum." In 1914, he points out, the NEA "had again taken up the question of curriculum reform and had appointed a series of special committees, including one on the modern languages." "This committee worked with interruptions through the war years but issued no official report." (A partial report, signed by the chairman, William B. Snow, appears in the 1915 edition of *Methods of Teaching Modern Languages* (Heath), pp. 114-169.) Again in 1920 a committee of the

⁵ *Modern Language Forum*, April, 1926, p. 10.

⁶ Published by The National Education Association, Washington, 1913.

⁷ *A Summary of Reports on the Modern Foreign Languages*, issued by The Modern Foreign Language Study and the Canadian Committee on Modern Languages. New York: Macmillan, 1931, pp. 2-4.

NEA, says Fife, set to work on modern foreign languages in the junior high school program; its report was published in 1927 in the *Fifth Year-book of the Department of Superintendence*. "Its recommendations were formulated without experimentation and on the basis of such informal inquiry as the members of the committee were able to conduct. They are general in their nature and reflect the attitude of the administrator rather than the teacher."

In the meantime the teachers had also been bestirring themselves. The Modern Language Association of America, it will be recalled, had included pedagogical papers in all its early meetings. In 1885, for instance, the eminent Harvard philologist, H. C. G. von Jagemann, presented two papers at the MLA meeting in Cambridge: one "On the Genitive in Old French" and the other "On the Use of English in Teaching Foreign Languages."⁸ In 1890, E. H. Babbitt presented a paper at the MLA on "How to Use Modern Languages as a Means of Mental Discipline." In 1889, E. S. Joynes had presented one on "Reading in Modern Language Study."⁹ Even as late as the MLA meeting in 1900, Thomas R. Price presented a paper on "The New Function of Modern Language Teaching."

Meanwhile the "Central Division" of the MLA had been established in 1895: it met in the Middle West while the parent organization met in the East (with a joint meeting every four years); and until the abolition in 1923 of the Central Division and the adoption of the present policy of alternating MLA meetings between the East and the Middle West (with one meeting on the Pacific Coast), the Central Division followed its own course, and regularly scheduled pedagogical papers and discussions at both the Germanic and Romance Language meetings. At the 1916 meeting of the Central Division, for instance, W. A. Nitze "explained the organization and plan of the new *Modern Language Journal*," Kenneth McKenzie read a paper on "Preparation for College Work in Languages," Barry Cerf one on "A Standard Course for First-Year College French," John D. Fitz-Gerald a similar paper on "First-Year College Spanish," and Bayard Quincy Morgan a paper on "Translation in the Classroom."

The parent Association, however, had been

steadily withdrawing from the pedagogical into the purely research field, and as is well known finally decided to become an exclusively research organization, a policy that was maintained until comparatively recent times, although the MLA paused in the pursuit of research long enough to issue significant pronouncement on the importance of modern foreign languages during World War I and World War II. It even "wet its toes" by setting up a "Committee on Trends in Education Adverse to the Teaching of Modern Languages" under the chairmanship of Howard Mumford Jones and a couple of years later the "Commission on Trends in Education" under my chairmanship (1939-1950) and subsequently that of Thomas Clark Pollock. The Commission has issued a number of important reports. While vigorously supported by successive administrations of the MLA, I am constrained to believe that a considerable proportion of the membership never approved either of the Jones Committee or of the Commission, regarding them as a kind of harmless vagary, a deviation from the straight and narrow path of research, but always to be kept strictly within bounds. In fact, I should not be surprised to learn that many "pure researchers" among the current members have a similar attitude, ranging from indulgent tolerance to disapproval, towards the MLA "Foreign Language Program" set up in 1952.

Along with the changes already mentioned, we should not overlook the steady growth in modern foreign language teachers' groups. The "regional associations," notably the New England Association of Colleges (founded in 1885), The Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (founded in 1887) and the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (founded in 1895), occasionally heard papers on modern foreign language teaching problems. At the 1912 meeting of the Middle States Association, for example, William B. Snow spoke on "Modern Language Study in American Public Schools. What Next?" He referred to the ferment going on in Europe

⁸ At the 1884 meeting von Jagemann had presented one "On the Use of the Foreign Language in the Class-Room."

⁹ Reprinted in *Methods of Teaching Modern Languages* (cit.), which also reprints von Jagemann's paper "On the Use of the Foreign Language in the Class-Room."

since the appearance in 1882 of Viëtor's *Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren*, the ineffectiveness of much modern foreign language teaching, the inadequate time allowed here as compared with European instruction, and the lack of trained teachers and of proper teacher-preparation. A significant passage in his address¹⁰ advocates "opportunities for some pupils to begin serious study of a foreign language in the grades, under competent instruction. From time to time this has been tried, and it failed." The reasons, he adds, "are to be found in administrative incompetence and timidity." Had Grandgent, more than twenty years before, while Director of Modern Languages in the Boston Public Schools, he says, "been given a free hand, he would undoubtedly have made a success of this (an experiment in teaching foreign languages in elementary schools) as of all his other undertakings." But Harvard "won him away from Boston."

Of existing foreign language teaching associations, The New England Modern Language Association, founded in 1903, seems to be the oldest. Its foundation, says Fife, followed by that of other regional organizations "was accompanied by the complete withdrawal of the Modern Language Association into the research field."¹¹ But the development of teachers' organizations was not restricted to regional associations: in fact, state and local groups—the latter sometimes restricted to teachers of a single language—were multiplying. Nor should we forget that in state educational associations sections devoted to the teaching of modern foreign languages, or to a single language, were becoming common, as they still are. Space permits mention of only a few organizations and dates. Among general regional associations, which, as stated, did not disdain to include discussions of foreign language teaching in their programs, The New England Association of Colleges was founded in 1885, The Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1887, The North Central Association in 1895. Following the foundation of The New England Modern Language Association in 1903, The Middle States Association of Modern Language Teachers came into being in 1913, The Association of Modern Language Teachers of the Central West and South in 1916. The state

associations of New York (1909) and New Jersey as well as other state associations were already in existence by that date. Among local groups, The New York City Association of German Teachers and The Chicago Society of Romance Language Teachers were already functioning, as well as the nucleus of the first national single language organization, The American Association of Teachers of Spanish (now the "AATSP"), which held a preliminary meeting in New York City in 1915 and formally organized as The Association of Spanish Teachers in 1916.

With the foundation of *The Modern Language Journal* in the same year, combined with other evidences of cooperativeness and interest, and in spite of delays caused by the war and by unfortunate dissension among teachers of the various languages, Fife tells us that "it became clear that the field was ripe for a study of the whole question of objectives, organization, and methods of modern language teaching."¹² Frederick P. Keppel, President of the Carnegie Corporation, "saw the need" and on his invitation a group of twenty-four teachers of modern foreign languages met at Atlantic City on December 31, 1923 for two days of conference and discussion. Out of this came The Modern Foreign Language Study of 1924-1928.

For the story of The Modern Foreign Language Study, I cannot improve on Chairman Robert Herndon Fife's own account.¹³ Following the Atlantic City meeting of December, 1923, already mentioned, a report was sent to The Carnegie Corporation and to The American Council on Education, "requesting that the former provide the financial means for the inquiry and the latter act as sponsor for the survey, selecting a committee which should be the directing and controlling body." Dr. Fife continues:

"Both requests were granted. Through the sympathetic efforts of Dr. Keppel the matter was laid before the Trustees of the Carnegie Corporation, who made a preliminary appropriation of \$15,000 to effect the organization and get the investigation under way, and in the fall of 1924 set aside \$60,000 a year for three years to carry through the

¹⁰ Reprinted in the 1915 edition of *Methods of Teaching Modern Languages*, cit.

¹¹ *Summary of Reports*, cit. p. 3.

¹² *Summary of Reports*, loc. cit.

¹³ *Summary of Reports*, pp. 4-9.

inquiry. In May, 1928, an additional \$10,000 was appropriated by the Carnegie Corporation for the use of the committee, and in October, 1928, a final sum of \$10,000 was added to help finance the work of publication. The Executive Committee of the American Council on Education, through the Director, Dr. C. R. Mann, consented to sponsor the investigation and to act as its fiscal and banking agents.

"The plan of organization included a Committee on Direction and Control and three special investigators, one for each of the three modern languages of major interest. This Committee was to have general responsibility for the survey. The following were appointed on the Committee on Direction and Control: Josephine T. Allin, Englewood High School, Chicago, Ill.; E. C. Armstrong, Princeton University; E. B. Babcock, New York University; Mary C. Burchinal, West High School, Philadelphia; J. P. W. Crawford, University of Pennsylvania; R. H. Fife, Columbia University; C. H. Grandgent, Harvard University; C. H. Handschin, Miami University; E. C. Hills, University of California; A. R. Hohlfield, University of Wisconsin; Josephine W. Holt, Richmond, Va.; R. H. Keniston, Cornell University (later University of Chicago); W. A. Nitze, University of Chicago; W. R. Price, New York State Department of Education; L. A. Roux, Newark Academy; Julius Sachs, Teachers College, Columbia University; E. B. de Sauzé, Cleveland, Ohio; W. B. Snow, Boston; Marian P. Whitney, Vassar College; M. A. Buchanan, University of Toronto, Chairman of the Canadian Committee.

"The general committee held its first meeting at White Plains, New York, on April 17 and 18. Mr. Fife was elected Chairman, Mr. Crawford, Vice-Chairman and Mr. Keniston, Secretary. The following were appointed Special Investigators: for French, Algernon Coleman of the University of Chicago; for German, C. M. Purin of Hunter College (later Director, Day School, University Extension, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee); for Spanish, C. A. Wheeler, Supervisor of Modern Languages in the Los Angeles schools (later Professor of Romance Languages, Tufts College). The officers of the Committee and the Special Investigators were delegated as a Committee on Investigation to carry on the survey under the authority of the Committee on Direction and Control. The title of The Modern Foreign Language Study was adopted for the investigation and through the courtesy of Columbia University, office space was given rent free from October 1924 to October 1928.

"A regional organization was set up to represent the eight geographical areas of the United States, with at least one representative from each of the states, and under the active leadership of regional chairmen became of great usefulness in the search for information and in sounding out local opinion and conditions. Through this organization the investigation was able to take on a really national character.

"The second meeting of the general committee was held at Princeton University December 31, 1924 to January 2, 1925. A Preliminary Report was made by the Committee on Investigation outlining the plan of campaign, including projected questionnaires for the gathering of data and a

tentative list of objectives. Professor V. A. C. Henmon was elected Adviser in Educational Psychology and added to the Committee on Investigation. A third meeting of the Committee was held at Chicago, December 31, 1925 to January 2, 1926. On this occasion the Committee on Investigation submitted a Report of Progress, setting forth what had been done in the various fields of inquiry, including the statistical projects, inquiries into the training of teachers, the testing campaign, and a group of special studies and researches. The Committee's fourth and final meeting was held at Toronto, September 15 to 17, 1927, partly as a joint meeting with the Canadian Committee. The reports of the Committee on Investigation were presented and discussed and finally approved for publication. Before adjourning the Committee adopted a resolution asking the American Council on Education to appoint a Committee on Modern Language Teaching, consisting of seven members, who should carry on further research and experiment in a manner initiated by the Modern Foreign Language Study.

"In cooperation with President Keppel, steps were taken to initiate a similar survey of modern languages in Canada. A preliminary conference was held in Ottawa June 9 and 10, 1924, and was attended by representatives of the provincial educational systems and by college and secondary-school teachers of the modern languages. Steps were taken to organize a general committee under the sponsorship of the Canadian Conference of Universities and the organization was completed at a meeting held in Winnipeg, November, 1924.

"The general committee was composed of the following: H. Ashton, University of British Columbia; M. A. Buchanan, University of Toronto, Chairman; W. E. Cannon, Laval University; Miss S. C. Doupe, Daniel McIntyre Institute; R. du Roure, McGill University; W. C. Ferguson, Ontario College of Education; R. H. Fife, Columbia University, Chairman of The Modern Foreign Language Study; E. L. Fuller, Wetaskiwin; Mrs. C. Roy Greenaway, formerly of Davenport High School; J. H. Heinzelmann, University of Manitoba; W. A. R. Kerr, University of Alberta; I. M. Levan, Toronto; J. A. Macdonald, University of Saskatchewan; G. H. Needler, University College, Toronto; W. F. Osborne, University of Manitoba; G. W. Parmelee, Quebec; J. F. Raiche, University of St. Francis Xavier; Miss M. Ross, formerly University of British Columbia; L. P. Shanks, University of Western Ontario; and J. E. Shaw, University of Toronto.

"The work of carrying on the investigation was entrusted to an executive committee consisting of the following five members: Messrs. Buchanan, Chairman; Ferguson, Kerr, Parmelee and Shaw. A regional organization was set up to secure information and give the inquiry a nationally representative character.

"H. E. Ford of Victoria College and Miss Léa Tanner of the Quebec Department of Education were appointed special investigators. Miss Tanner was succeeded in 1927 by R. K. Hicks of Queens University, later of Trinity College. Professor Henmon was elected as supervisor of achievement tests."

"The relations of the American and the Canadian Committees were close and cordial from the first and a com-

plete liaison between the two was maintained throughout the investigation. Many of the meetings of the American Committee on Investigation were attended by the Canadian Chairman and his associates; indeed, for a considerable part of the inquiry the committee functioned as a joint committee for the two countries. Research undertakings were jointly planned and jointly supported from the budgets of the two committees and all of the volumes containing the results of test administrations and of special researches are joint publications. Volumes IV, XII and XIII explore American conditions as to enrollment, organization of courses and the training of modern language teachers and these bear the imprint of the American committee alone. Similarly Volumes VI and VII present the situation in these fields as found in Canada. The remaining twelve volumes are joint issues. The volumes mentioned, however, do not measure the entire scope of undertakings on which the two committees cooperated, for to them should be added studies and experiments covered by a number of special reports in periodicals and elsewhere. The relationship between the American and Canadian Committees, with a growing knowledge of each other's problems as it developed month by month, was one of the most important features of the inquiry and one which will undoubtedly be of lasting value for international cooperation between modern language teachers on this continent. It developed in the progress of the investigation that while in both Canada and the United States modern language teaching faces difficulties of a peculiarly national sort, such as the two-language situation in Quebec and the problem of the junior high school in this country, as regards the main questions of the materials and technique of teaching foreign languages, both countries have a common task."

The volumes that resulted from the work of the Study, a list of which is included in the *Summary of Reports* and in Cole and Tharp¹⁴ are all of definite importance. It may not be invidious, however, to point out that some of them marked distinct advances in our knowledge, growing out of the scientific, empirical, and statistical approach adopted by the Study—an approach that makes it unique in its time among subject-matter surveys in the field of education.

Certain volumes published by the Study are significant beyond the ordinary because they represent these new tendencies. Instances are experimental studies on testing (vol. I, Ben D. Wood); a laboratory study on reading, including eye-movements (vol. II, G. T. Buswell); achievement tests in the modern foreign languages (vol. V, V.A.C. Henmon); prognosis tests (vol. XIV, Henmon and others); and a volume of researches and experiments on modern foreign language teaching by fifteen scholars at various institutions (vol. XVII). Statistical studies are included in the volumes

on enrollments (vol. IV, C. A. Wheeler and others), and on the training of modern foreign language teachers (vol. XIII, C. M. Purin). General surveys deal with modern foreign language instruction in Canada (vol. VI), and the administration of modern foreign language teaching in Canada, including statistics on enrollments and teacher-training, testing, the administration of oral and aural tests in French, and a comparison of English pupils with French pupils in Québec with respect to reading norms in French. Professor Fife's *Summary of Reports* (vol. I), published in 1931, after all the other volumes had appeared, is a well-balanced summing-up of the entire study.

One of the most significant by-products of the Study was the impetus it gave to frequency-counts of vocabulary, idioms, and syntax. Word-lists based on frequency of usage were published for Spanish vocabulary (vol. III, M. A. Buchanan); for German (vol. IX, B. Q. Morgan), and French (vol. XVI, George E. Vander Beke). Idiom frequency-lists for German (vol. X, E. F. Hauch); for Spanish (vol. XI, Hayward Keniston); and French (vol. XV, Frederic D. Cheydleur), were also published. Following the conclusion of the Study, and as a logical extension of its work, The Committee on Modern Language Teaching of The American Council on Education and its successors, The Committee on Modern Languages and The Committee on Foreign Language Teaching, sponsored the publication of further frequency-lists, including Keniston's *Spanish Syntax List* (Holt, 1937), for which the gifted compiler worked out a new technique; Richard E. Clark and Lawrence Poston's *French Syntax List* (Holt, 1943); a *Graded Word Book of Brazilian Portuguese*, by Charles B. Brown, Wesley M. Carr, and Milton Shane (Crofts, 1945); a *Brazilian Portuguese Idiom List*, by C. B. Brown and M. L. Shane (Vanderbilt University Press, 1951); and *The Russian Word Count* by Harry Josselson (Wayne University Press, 1953). We still lack a German syntax list, on which H. A. Basilius of Wayne University has been working for a long time, but funds for its publication apparently have not been forthcoming.

This is not the place to recount the history

¹⁴ See Bibliographical Note, p. 295.

of the American Council's Committee on Foreign Language Teaching and its predecessors, of which Robert Herndon Fife served as chairman from the inception of The Modern Foreign Language Study in 1924 until 1950, when I succeeded him. Not only did Dr. Fife "spark" nearly all these frequency-count volumes, but he conducted, with H. T. Manuel, an exhaustive study of bilingualism as it affects language competence,¹⁵ and also was the moving spirit behind the continuations of *An Analytical Bibliography of Modern Language Methodology* by M. A. Buchanan and E. D. MacPhee (vol. VIII of the Study publications): namely the bibliography, with the same title, for 1927-32, by Algernon Coleman and Agnes Jacques; a third volume of the *Analytical Bibliography*, covering 1932-37, by Coleman and Fife; and a fourth volume, 1937-42, by Fife and others. Unfortunately this vital project had to be suspended, despite the tremendous importance of methodology and related matters from 1942 on, including the professionally active war years and the post-war period, because of lack of financial support from the foundations; and in 1955 the Committee on Foreign Language Teaching itself, for similar reasons, since the administration of The American Council on Education saw no hope of obtaining further financial support for its publication activities, went out of existence.

I have not mentioned as yet the so-called "Coleman Report," otherwise known as *The Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in the United States*, by Algernon Coleman (vol. XII of the Study's publications), the appearance of which set off a long, wordy, at times uninformed and in some instances violent and embittered controversy, caused by Dr. Coleman's advocacy of the "reading objective," for which he set up in his report a specific course of instruction. He was attacked by fellow-teachers not only for his basic ideas but for exceeding his "mandate." The storm continued for some years, and only the approach of World War II, with the consequent vastly increased emphasis on the "oral approach" and on conversational fluency, brought the "controversy" to an end, officially at least. Incidentally, the lamented Coleman also compiled for the Committee on Modern Foreign Language Teaching a volume of *Experiments and Studies in Modern Language Teaching*

(Chicago University Press, 1934).

The threat of World War II and later of our own possible involvement in it inspired perhaps the most enthusiastic, even excited, activities among modern foreign language specialists (and among people who were far from being specialists, or who perhaps did not know a single foreign language themselves) that America has ever witnessed. "Miraculous" new methods, "Learning Languages in a Hurry," and similar clichés were on the lips, or rattling off the typewriters, of people who hardly knew what they were talking about. The sober fact was that hard work, long hours, strong motivation, and tiny classes were producing results that any competent modern foreign language teacher could have produced, under the same favorable conditions, at any time in the previous half-century or more. For concrete results in the "unusual" languages major credit should go to Mortimer Graves and J Milton Cowan of The American Council of Learned Societies.¹⁶ Mortimer Graves was one of the very few Americans who not only foresaw the dire need we faced for men trained in what he jocularly used to call "the funny languages" but actually did something about it. Strongly supported by Dr. Waldo G. Leland, Executive Director of the "ACLS", and with the equally vigorous cooperation of J Milton Cowan, Secretary of The Linguistic Society of America, and others, not only were special preparatory "institutes" set up, among which the "Summer Institutes" at the University of Wyoming and the University of Vermont (for Portuguese only) stand out, but fellowship grants were made to enable linguistically-inclined young Americans to equip themselves in the "unusual languages," "informants" were sought out (and found in some unusual places), and materials provided to serve needed courses, including two manuals: *An Outline Guide to the Practical Study of For-*

¹⁵ This study eventually developed into an exhaustive report, published under the title *The Teaching of English in Puerto Rico* (San Juan: Department of Education, 1951). A by-product was the preparation, under the direction of Dr. Manuel, of the "Inter-American Tests" for testing bilingual achievement, now distributed by the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N. J.

¹⁶ See Bibliographical Note, p. 295. An antidote to the "miraculous methods" mirage will be found in my article, "Learning Languages in a Hurry"—But Not by Miracles," in *School and Society* for December 18, 1943.

eign Languages, by Leonard Bloomfield (Yale), and *An Outline of Linguistic Analysis*, by Bernard Bloch (Brown) and George L. Trager (Yale). Courses offered during the academic year 1941-42 and the Summer of 1942 included: African languages (Fanti, Swahili, Hausa, African Pidgin English), Arabic (Egyptian, Syro-Palestinian, Moroccan, Iraqi), Burmese, Chinese, Modern Greek, Hindustani, Hungarian, Icelandic, Iranian (Persian), Japanese, Korean, Kurdish, Malay, Mongol, Pashtu (Afghan), Pidgin English (Melanesian), Portuguese, Punjabi, Russian, Thai (Siamese), and Turkish.

The following description of the Intensive Language Program is quoted from Graves and Cowan's *Report of the First Year's Operation of the Intensive Language Program*:

"The Intensive Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies is supported by two subventions of fifty thousand dollars each made by the Rockefeller Foundation in 1941 for a two-year period. Under the terms of these grants funds were furnished respectively for 'the development of intensive instruction in modern (subsequently interpreted to mean "unusual," i.e., exclusive of French, German, Spanish, and Italian) languages' and for 'intensive instruction in Chinese, Japanese, and Russian.' Accordingly it is assumed that the success of the Program is to be measured by the amount and quality of intensive instruction in these languages provided through its operation. On this score the Summer Program for 1942 speaks for itself: fifty-six courses, in twenty-six languages, in eighteen universities, involving some six or seven hundred students, is by far the most impressive array of intensive language instruction ever presented in American academic life. It is true that half a dozen of these courses might have been offered without the intervention of the Program, but even these half-dozen have been materially aided by it. The other half-hundred are entirely the creation of the Program itself. It should be added that a dozen of these were, for lack of students or some other cause, not successfully completed. Their claim to enumeration, consequently, is only that they were available if demanded.

"The Program is administered by two committees of the Council: the Committee on the National School of Modern Oriental Languages and Civilizations (Mortimer Graves, ACLS, chairman; Franklin Edgerton, Yale University; and G. Howland Shaw, United States Department of State); and the Committee on Intensive Language Instruction (Henry Grattan Doyle, The George Washington University, chairman; Mortimer Graves, ACLS, secretary; William Berrien, Rockefeller Foundation; George A. Kennedy, Yale University; Kemp Malone, Johns Hopkins University, and Philip E. Mosely, Cornell University). Since April 1, 1942 the details of operation have been in the hands of J. M. Cowan, of the University of Iowa, Secretary of the Linguistic Society of America, as Director of the Intensive Language Program. The general division of in-

terest between the two committees is that the first, the Committee on the School, concerns itself more with the scientific features of supplying implementation for instruction in these languages, as will be explained later on in the report, while the operations of the second, the Committee on Instruction, relate more intimately to the provision of courses of instruction. This division, however, has not been rigorously maintained; either Committee retains the right to engage in either type of operation whenever its own ends can thus best be served. The Committees have worked in completed harmony.

"The Program operates in the belief that an intensive course in any language can be offered in a college or university whenever there can be assured a sufficient number of tuition-paying students to provide reimbursement to the institution for the expenses involved. The first step, consequently, in encouraging the establishment of a course is the guarantee of such sufficient number of students. Funds are then utilized for the provision of grants to individual students in order that these guarantees may be fulfilled. During the first year of operation, however, the nature of the language under discussion, local conditions, the novelty of the method, and other considerations often prevented the immediate application of this formula, and, because the element of time was considered important, recourse was had to other types of financial aid. Nevertheless, the year's activity has been a gradual approximation to the system of assistance described.

"By an intensive course the Committees mean a course which occupies the full time of the student, generally computed at about fifteen hours of classroom instruction, fifteen hours of drill with native speakers, and from twenty to thirty hours of individual preparation per week. Two or three six-week sessions of this character, separated by short intervals of rest, seem to yield the best results in the shortest time. Here, too, however, accommodation has been sometimes made to suit university schedules and other special circumstances, though the year as a whole exhibits this same progress towards a more nearly uniform procedure.

"In some of the languages with which the Committees are concerned, for instance, Chinese, Japanese, Russian, and Portuguese, there was already a modest though improving American tradition of intensive elementary instruction. Some implements—grammars, textbooks, phonograph recordings, dictionaries, etc.—were at hand and these were constantly being bettered; there was a small, though quite inadequate, personnel equipped for instruction; and the methods of the intensive approach were beginning to be worked out. But in by far the largest number of the other languages, these *desiderata* simply did not exist in the English language, and frequently were not available in any language at all. In Malay, for example, the best implements were in Dutch, a fact which makes them all but useless to the American student. In addition they were, on account of difficulties of transport, not obtainable in sufficient quantity. Finally, because they had not been prepared by scholars with sufficient technical linguistic competence and in particular because they had not been prepared for intensive instruction, they were, even if they could be secured, in the opinion of the Committee on the School and its advisers, totally inadequate for the work envisaged.

Moreover, since all experience with intensive language instruction had already shown a high correlation between good results and good implementation, it became obvious that the first task of the Committee must necessarily be the provision of the implements of instruction before instruction itself. Perusal of the details of the Program will show, consequently, very considerable devotion of funds and efforts to the development of grammars and other implements of study and teaching. This process, analogous to tooling on the industrial front, was the only firm basis for production later.

"Fortunately, one realm of scholarship in which America has been preëminent over the past decade is that of technical linguistics. Nowhere else has the descriptive study of unknown languages as they are used by native speakers been pushed so far forward, and nowhere has there been created such a group of younger scholars equipped with high technical competence in this field. The Committee on the School, consequently, set about the systematic discovery of native speakers (called "informants") of Thai, Korean, Persian, Turkish, Malay, Swahili, Hausa, and the other languages likely to be necessary during the war emergency and the association with them of younger technical linguists who could use descriptive methods to provide the basic materials for the implementation of study. In the process of this operation it was decided to experiment with the actual formulation of a course by this method, in which the control and the presentation of the descriptive features of the instruction would be in the hands of the American technical linguist and the incessant drill-work would be furnished by the native-speaking informant. It was hoped in this way to have the benefit of instruction by native teachers combined with the advantage of instruction in accordance with the most efficient employment of linguistic techniques."

Later misguided enthusiasts "took up" (like Hermione and her "little group of serious thinkers") the work of the Program and its applications in the "ASTP" (Army Specialized Training Program) and "CATS" (Civil Affairs Training Program) classes, as well as the Navy's programs, especially the Navy's highly successful Japanese School at Boulder, Colorado. Educationists who for years had "dragged their feet" on efforts to awaken Americans to language needs¹⁷ and sensational writers began to parrot slogans of the type already mentioned. Examples akin to "Languages in a Hurry" were "Languages Without Grammar," "Learning Languages as a Child Learns Its Native Tongue," "Why Can't We Teach the Army Way?," and the like, with frequent references to the "miraculous Army methods." Owners of what I long ago christened "the speak-easy schools of languages" were not slow to capitalize on all this publicity. To bring some common sense and sobriety into the situation, Graves

and Cowan finally issued "A Statement on Intensive Language Instruction" (published in *Hispania* for February, 1944 and some months later in *The German Quarterly*), which I quote:

"Inasmuch as there is bound to be—in fact has already appeared—a certain amount of criticism of 'extravagant claims' alleged to be made by the advocates of modern intensive language teaching, it seems wise to set down the rather modest 'claims' which these advocates really do present. They follow:

"(1) The 'dribble method' of learning languages (three hours a week for years) has failed to give students practical command of any language. It may, of course, have had other educational values, but the need now is for practical speaking command.

"(2) Better results are to be obtained by more concentrated use of the students' time (a maximum of ten hours per week). Only continued experiment will give us exact knowledge as to when, in the increase in concentration, a period of diminishing returns sets in. Our present guess is that, if the study is to occupy three months or more, about twenty-five hours a week of classroom contact and supervised study is the optimum, though there are varying opinions among the advocates with respect to this.

"(3) Major emphasis at first should be placed upon the acquisition of spoken languages. There is a variety of opinions as to exactly when study of the written language should begin, but this difference does not affect the general principle.

"(4) Language instruction should be controlled by a trained technical linguist. In the ideal case he would be completely bilingual and an inspired and inspiring teacher. Unfortunately these qualities are not combined in one person sufficiently frequently to meet present demands. Moreover, whenever they are so combined we have a person so valuable that his time should not be inefficiently used in doing the increased drill-work necessary for proper control of spoken language. This drill-work should be carried on by native speakers who need only good intelligence, good ears, an acceptable dialect, some small training, and tight control. Since the optimum condition is too infrequently met to supply the language needs of the present moment, recourse has to be had to such approximations to it as are possible under the existent local circumstances.

"(5) There is probably no new *method* of language training. It is most likely that the successful features of the alleged new method have been implicit in all good language teaching. Since, however, there have been hitherto practically no materials planned for *intensive* study of *spoken* language, there are now appearing some new *materials*. These are in varying stages of experiment and trial and will doubtless be greatly improved with experience. Intelligent and thoughtful criticism of them will be welcome.

"(6) Language is not to be taught 'without grammar,' nor 'as a child learns his native tongue.' A student should learn all the grammar useful to him, but he should learn it scientifically, not as a kind of theology, and he should learn

¹⁷ See my article "Americans, Awake to Language Needs," *The American School Board Journal* for March, 1941.

it only when and as it becomes useful to him. Moreover, he should not learn language as a child, but with all the tools that maturity, intelligence, and education have given him.

"(7) Within the limits of agreement on the need for intensive instruction in spoken language by scientifically-trained personnel, there is room for wide divergence as to detail and even for the personal eccentricities of teachers.

"(8) The expression 'intensive language' is sometimes used in a context which implies the inclusion of area study. This is not a necessary, though it is sometimes a useful, extension of the term. We all—even the alleged 'mechanists'—acknowledge that a language does not operate in a vacuum."

The Army's ASTP program began active operation in April, 1943 and ended, rather suddenly, on April 1, 1944. An unfortunate effect of this was to leave "high and dry" many young men who had "passed up" opportunities to enter officer candidates' training schools in favor of intensive language training—without the commissions they might otherwise have earned. Fortunately, a carefully planned survey of the program, its results, and its implications for post-war teaching of modern foreign languages in secondary and elementary schools, was under way and completed before the demise of the ASTP. The staff of the survey, financed by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, was as follows:

Director: Henry Grattan Doyle, The George Washington University

Survey Group:

Frederick B. Agard, Princeton University
Robert J. Clements, Harvard University
William S. Hendrix, Ohio State University
Elton Hocking, Northwestern University
Stephen L. Pitcher, St. Louis Public Schools
Albert van Eerden, Princeton University

The results of the survey were published that year (1944) by The Modern Language Association of America as one of the publications of the Commission on Trends in Education. The report has been praised for its factual approach, its lack of bias, and its well-balanced judgments, made and agreed to by the survey staff as a whole. More elaborate studies of war-time language and area experiences, especially as to their applications to post-war education, are those of Matthew and of Fenton.^{17a}

One important fact about the ASTP should not be forgotten: namely, that the teachers who carried the major burden in ASTP courses set up in colleges and universities across the

country were largely "old-fashioned" modern foreign language teachers, who rejoiced at the opportunity to teach under what to them were ideal conditions: small classes, ample time, and strong motivation. With assignment to the infantry (unmentioned, of course) hovering in the background for those who did not "hump themselves," wilful sluggards seem to have been remarkably and understandably few in the ASTP. If there was any weakness it was owing to insistence on the "theology" (to borrow a term applied to grammar by Graves and Cowan) of the combined instructor system—the "structural analyst" plus the "informant"—in cases in which both competences already existed in one person, a situation described above by Graves and Cowan as the "ideal." After the war, Robert Herndon Fife, Stephen A. Freeman, and I were invited by President Seymour to visit the intensive classes at Yale and make a report on them. This report is still confidential, as far as I know. But I recall visiting a German class in which the analyst, a brilliant young teacher and scholar of native German background, was apparently compelled to submit to the "theology" of the "informant method," the informant being a moderately educated "native," a typical comfortable *Hausfrau*, whom the professor had to consult, according to the sacred "informant" ritual, on all questions of usage. As one student put it, "We all knew that Dr. ———— knew twice as much as she did about the illustrative material on which he was obliged to consult her."

But in the main the system worked—better of course in the "unusual" languages than in the "common" ones. It apparently worked especially well at the Japanese School at the University of Colorado, and I can testify that it worked well at the Army School at Monterey, California, which I visited later on as chairman of a committee appointed by the Air Force to report on service schools of languages.

Among special language projects that developed during the pre-war, war, and post-war years were: the early Air Force program in Spanish, for which I served as chairman of the Advisory Committee; the English Institute at the University of Michigan, still in operation,

^{17a} See Bibliographical Note, p. 295.

where distinguished service has been rendered by Charles C. Fries and Albert H. Marckwardt; the State Department's Foreign Service Institute, whose language programs are directed by Henry L. Smith, Jr., an active figure in the Armed Services language programs throughout the war; the reorganized foreign language program at Cornell University, directed by J. Milton Cowan, already mentioned as a distinguished figure in war-time Service programs; and the Washington Inter-American Training Center, which I directed for its two years of existence, 1942-44, and which provided training in Spanish and Portuguese and in Latin American civilization and affairs for 10,000 Government employees during that period.¹⁸ Space does not permit mention of other by-products of war-time interest, but I cannot forebear mention of a program developed in a sister-institution, the Georgetown Institute of Languages and Linguistics, under the direction of Colonel Leon Dostert, an old-time teacher of French, who distinguished himself as General Eisenhower's French interpreter, as director of the multilingual translation system at the Nuremberg trials and at the United Nations, and is earning even greater distinction at the Georgetown Institute.

Finally we come to the Foreign Language Program of The Modern Language Association of America, financed by the Rockefeller Foundation and directed from 1952 to 1956 by William R. Parker, Professor of English at New York University and Secretary of the "MLA". Dr. Parker has had "assists" from C. Grant Loomis, a professor of German; Donald Walsh, a preparatory-school teacher of Spanish and present editor of *Hispania*; Theodore Andersson, a professor at Yale whose major interest is French; and Kenneth Mildener, a Ph.D. in English, who by tireless effort and industry has steeped himself in information about modern foreign language classes in elementary schools and has published reports to prove it. The "Program" has had available the counsel of an Advisory Committee of modern foreign language teachers of distinction. It has held a number of conferences, and encouraged others, in which the perennial modern foreign language questions, including the vital one of teacher-preparation, have been discussed and

reports issued. Any considered judgment as to the effectiveness of the "Program," in terms of the results achieved as measured against the funds expended and the hours of work and effort contributed by many devoted workers in the "MLA" vineyard, must await the completion of the program and critical study of the wealth of materials emanating from the MLA offices or regularly published in the preliminary pages of *PMLA*, its official journal.

THE FOUNDATION OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL AND THE FEDERATION

Before beginning this part of my sketch, I must pause to pay a well-deserved tribute to Professor Charles W. French, of Boston University, the senior member of the Executive Committee of the Federation, with many years of consecutive service as the elected delegate from The New England Modern Language Association, one of the charter members of the Federation. A close friend and one-time colleague of William B. Snow, of the Boston English High School, the first President of the Federation, Professor French also served as President and for a term of years as Secretary-Treasurer of the Federation. Not only did he establish a record for efficiency and accuracy in handling its accounts and records, but (perhaps because of his possession of a keener historical sense than his predecessors enjoyed), he was at great pains to put earlier records in better order and fill in certain obvious gaps. All who follow him in Federation work owe him a tremendous debt for his unstinting and unselfish service.

Many others have of course done their share, and more, in the service of the Federation and the *Journal*. I wish space permitted devoting a laudatory paragraph to other secretaries, presidents, editors, business managers, and committee members, whose names could with ample justification be "writ large" on the tab-

¹⁸ See "Practical Inter-Americanism," by Henry Grat-tan Doyle, *Bulletin of the Pan American Union* for August, 1944, pp. 429-436, and "The Conversational Approach to Spanish, as Adopted in the Spanish Classes of the Washington Inter-American Training Center," by H.G.D. and Francisco Aguilera, *Hispania* for February, 1943, pp. 72-76.

lets of the "Modern Foreign Language Teachers' Hall of Fame." Perhaps mention of them *passim* in these pages, and the appended list of officers of the Federation and the *Journal*, will make amends, inadequate though they may be, for failing to pay extensive and deserved individual tribute to all of them. But I must not fail to mention Stephen L. Pitcher, who has served the Federation long and faithfully as president, as secretary-treasurer, as business manager of the *Journal*, and in many other ways. Years ago, he pioneered the introduction of foreign languages in the elementary schools of St. Louis, and he has conducted since its inception the department in the *Journal* devoted to modern foreign languages in the elementary schools, as well as a similar department in *Hispania*. During World War II he not only served as Chairman of the Federation's Committee on the Place of the Modern Foreign Languages in American Education but also directed a nation-wide program of regional conferences on the teaching of Spanish and Portuguese sponsored by the National Education Association in cooperation with the Office of Inter-American Affairs. In this activity the U. S. Office of Education, the Division of Cultural Affairs of the Department of State, and The American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese also cooperated. Funds for this project were provided by the Office of Inter-American Affairs, directed by Nelson A. Rockefeller. The National Education Association published in August, 1945 an impressive pamphlet, compiled by Mr. Pitcher, entitled "The Teaching of Spanish and Portuguese: A Report on a Series of Regional Conferences, Sponsored by The National Education Association with the Cooperation of the Office of Inter-American Affairs." This was only one of Mr. Pitcher's war-time activities; he also was one of the active field-workers in the "Survey of Language Classes in the ASTP" conducted under my direction, and personally contributed a useful section on post-war implications of the ASTP for elementary and secondary-school teaching of modern foreign languages to the second edition of the report of the Survey published by the MLA in 1944.

Much of the early history of the Federation and the *Journal* is told reminiscently by Messrs. Snow, Busse, Handschin, Bagster-

Collins, and others of the "galaxy," already mentioned, in the Jubilee Issue of *The Modern Language Journal* published on its "silver anniversary" in 1941. Still more can be found in the early volumes of the *Journal* and the materials carefully gathered by Secretary French and others.

The foregoing section of this sketch provides the background and setting for the recital of the events that culminated in the *Journal* and the Federation.

Until the *Journal* came into being, the *Monatshefte für deutsche Sprache und Pädagogik* (later the *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht*), published at the University of Wisconsin, was the only national journal in the modern foreign language field, but naturally it dealt almost wholly with the teaching of German. General educational publications, however, such as the *School Review*, *Educational Review*, and *Journal of Education*, as Professor C. F. Kayser pointed out in the first article in the first issue of *The Modern Language Journal* (October, 1916), published articles sporadically on modern foreign language teaching; and the proceedings or bulletins of active regional, state, or local associations (notably those of New England, New York State, and Wisconsin) also contained "highly valuable" material, to quote Kayser again. I have already mentioned the *Proceedings* of the National Education Association and the earlier years of the official publications of the MLA as yielding papers on instructional methods and aims. The MLA discontinued its pedagogical sessions, according to Handschin in his "galaxy" article in 1911. I am not certain that this date is wholly reliable. Certainly the Central Division, as I have already stated, was still hearing pedagogical papers much later than that, and it is not unlikely that the "parent" MLA had discontinued them before 1911. At all events, there was undoubtedly a strong feeling, increased during the pre-World War I years, but existing before that time, that we needed both a national journal exclusively devoted to the teaching of modern foreign languages on the secondary-school and college levels, and a national organization representing not only both these levels but all the languages commonly taught.

In the East, these stirrings manifested themselves in concrete form at an informal meeting

during the MLA convention at Columbia University in December, 1914, with Professor C. F. Kayser of Hunter College acting as chairman. The associations informally represented were three in number: New England, New York State, and the Middle States and Maryland. A committee of fifteen, five from each of these associations, was appointed, in consultation with the respective presidents, as follows: New England, Miss Young, and Messrs. Buell, Fife, Snow and von Klenze; New York, Miss Ballard, Miss Whitney, and Messrs. Busse, Host and Monteser; Middle States and Maryland, Miss Burchinal, and Messrs. Downer, Hervey, Hoskins, and Kayser.

The foregoing committee met at Columbia University on February 20, 1915 and reached agreement on a number of points and adopted a tentative constitution, subject of course to ratification by the respective associations, for the formation of a federation of the three associations. Interesting condensed items from the committee's minutes follow. The name suggested for the new journal was *Journal of Modern Language Teaching*; price, 20 cents per copy, 75 cents a year (four issues); for members of the associations, 50 cents a year, each association to be responsible for payment of subscriptions for its *entire* membership. A Managing Editor, Business Manager, two Assistant Business Managers, and nine Associate Editors (equally divided among the three associations) were to be appointed. Policy and conduct of the journal were to be decided by the Managing Editor with the advice of the Associate Editors ("Editorial Board"), to meet once a year as a whole. The Business Manager was to be responsible to the Managing Editor on matters of policy and routine, and to the Treasurer of the Federation in matters of finance. The following officers and directors were elected: *Chairman*, C. F. Kayser, Hunter College; *Secretary-Treasurer*, W. R. Price, State Education Department, Albany; *Directors*, Middle States: Miss Mary C. Burchinal, West Philadelphia High School for Girls, and John Preston Hoskins, Princeton University; New England: Camillo von Klenze, Brown University, and Kenneth McKenzie, Yale University; New York: Paul E. Titsworth, Alfred University, and Miss Frances Paget, Morris High School, New York City. Elijah William

Bagster-Collins, of Teachers College, Columbia University, was elected *Managing Editor*, and Adolf Busse, of Hunter College, *Business Manager*. *Associate Editors* (with "staggered" terms of four, three, and two years) were elected for the New England Association, William B. Snow, Boston English High School, and Robert Herndon Fife (then "Jr."), Wesleyan University; for New York, H. C. Davidsen, Cornell University, Miss Anna Woods, Ballard, Teachers College, Columbia, and Arthur G. Host, Troy High School; for the Middle States, J. P. Wickersham Crawford, University of Pennsylvania, Miss Marian P. Whitney, Vassar College, and Carl F. Krause, Jamiaca High School, New York. The *Assistant Business Managers* chosen were Walter D. Head, Haverhill (Mass.) High School, and Miss Annie Dunster, William Penn High School for Girls.

In the meantime the Middle West was also astir. On April 1, 1915, a group of members of the foreign language departments at the University of Chicago, headed by William A. Nitze, had proposed that the University provide a subvention of \$1000 annually for five years "for the establishment of a journal devoted to the teaching of the modern foreign languages, to be printed and published by the University of Chicago Press." Each of these groups, East and West, was at the outset apparently completely unaware of the other's plans; but that situation lasted only a short time, for on April 12 Professor Kayser wrote to the Chicago group telling of the proposed federation and its plans, and on May 3, Professor Thomas Atkinson Jenkins of Chicago, in the absence of Professors Nitze and Cutting, apparently the prime movers in the plan, replied, quoting a remark by Professor Hohlfeld that the foundation of two journals "would be little short of a calamity"; stating that it would seem "quite out of the question to found a middle west subscription list on the rather incomplete membership of the Central Division of the Modern Language Association"; referring to the Classical Association organized a few years before by Professor Capps, in which high-school and college teachers had combined; and ending by suggesting conferences in an effort to get together.

The result of these stirrings and bestirrings was that at the MLA meeting at Cleveland in December, 1915, by which time The Association

of Modern Language Teachers of the Central West and South had been formed, eight representatives of the "Federation" (East) and eight from the Central West and South (also referred to as a "federation"), acting on the authority of their respective groups, agreed to join in publishing a journal, to be known as *The Modern Language Journal*, elected E. W. Bagster-Collins as Managing Editor and Adolf Busse and Algernon Coleman as joint Business Managers, and selected Associate Editors equally divided between the East and the Middle West. The principle of equal distribution of Associate Editors between the Romance and Germanic languages was also agreed upon.

In October, 1916, as already indicated, the first issue of the *Journal* appeared with the aforesaid Managing Editor and Business Manager; a group of five Associate Editors: J. P. W. Crawford; W. A. Nitze; J. W. Deihl of the Wisconsin High School, Madison; B. J. Vos, Indiana University; and Mary V. Young, Mount Holyoke College; and eight "Consulting Editors" as follows: from New York, Miss Whitney and Messrs. Host and Davidsen; from the Middle States, Edwin B. Davis of Rutgers and C. A. Krause; from New England, W. H. Buell of the Hotchkiss School and C. H. Grandgent of Harvard; from the Central West and South, H. Almstedt, University of Missouri; J. L. Borgerhoff, Western Reserve University; Miss Lilia Casís, University of Texas; L. Dudley, Emporia (Kansas) Normal School; Otto Heller, Washington University; A. La Meslée, Tulane University; Kenneth McKenzie, University of Illinois; and M. Winkler, University of Michigan. In 1918 Louis A. Roux, Newark Academy, replaced Edwin B. Davis, Professor Davidsen was no longer listed, and Fannie A. Baker, Fort Smith High School, and Alfonso De Salvio of Northwestern University had replaced La Meslée and McKenzie.

Early in 1919 a tentative constitution for a National Federation of Modern Language Teachers was drafted by correspondence between the Eastern and Western groups, published in the *Journal* for April, 1919, and subsequently ratified, with slight changes, by the various associations. In July, 1918 the Executive Committee, composed of four representatives from the East (the New Jersey Association

having been added to the Eastern group, making four associations, each with one representative) and four from the Middle West, met in accordance with the nascent constitution; Algernon Coleman was elected Managing Editor, and E. L. C. Morse Business Manager (with Adolf Busse as his Eastern representative). The Consulting Editorships were abolished, the five Associate Editorships being continued, three to be from the section *not* represented by the Managing Editor, two from the other section.

The rest is history. Subsequent changes were the increase of the terms of Managing Editor and Business Manager to four years, and a variety of changes made from time to time in the number of members of the editorial staff, with a marked tendency as time went on to assign them specific functions, as at present. Lists of the Presidents, Secretary-Treasurers, Managing Editors, and Business Managers, with their approximate terms of service, are appended. The constituent and affiliated associations have been listed in each issue of the *Journal*. In addition to those now listed, the following are some of the state associations listed in the past but now absent: Virginia, Oklahoma, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Iowa, Indiana, Nebraska, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Texas, North Carolina, and Southern California. Some are now represented by The Central States Association. A few have "disintegrated," to borrow Handschin's term, but others are still among our most active associations. The Pacific Coast Federation enjoyed a fairly long period of active participation in the affairs of the Federation and furnished one Business Manager, but it, too, finally went out of existence, largely perhaps because of the geographical distances involved. There are still fine nuclei, however, for such a regional group in Southern California and in the Northwest, judging by interest recently shown, and we may yet see a revived Pacific Coast organization.

In addition to the charter members (New England, New York, New Jersey, Middle States, Central States) the other constituent members of the Federation are The Pennsylvania State Modern Language Association and five "AAT" associations: The American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese,

The American Association of Teachers of French, The American Association of Teachers of German, The American Association of Teachers of Italian, and the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and Eastern European Languages.

The circumstances attending the admission of the "AAT's" as constituent members of the Federation require explanation. Under the original constitution, additional associations could be admitted to regular membership, with a representative on the Executive Committee, on the basis of having 300 members who were subscribers to the *Journal*. At the 1921 meeting of the Executive Committee, the AATSP was "invited" to affiliate with the National Federation. Through the initiative of the late Professor John D. Fitz-Gerald of the University of Illinois (later of the University of Arizona), for many years active in The Central States Association, the AATSP, and the Federation, the ATSP seems to have demonstrated that it had 300 members who were also subscribers to the *Journal*, for it was allotted an official delegate (Fitz-Gerald) in 1923 who in 1924 was elected President of the Federation. In the meantime the other AAT's (except AATSEEL, which was founded later) had been organized, and the AATI was admitted to the Federation in 1923, the AATG and the AATF in 1927. Under the revised constitution of the Federation (published in the *Journal* for May, 1925), the Executive Committee had been authorized to admit member associations and "fix the basis of their representation." The 300-subscription requirement was therefore not applied in admitting the other "AT's"; it would probably have been difficult to apply in the case of AATG and AATF, manifestly impossible in that of the AATI and subsequently that of "AATSEEL". All of the "AAT's" now have one delegate apiece on the Executive Committee.

In connection with these "national language associations" and their relations to the Federation, a few observations seem to be in order at this point. First come some quotations from Bayard Quincy Morgan, taken from his article in the 1941 "Jubilee Issue":

"One of these ideas, I regret to say, met with complete failure, and I attribute some part of our professional woes today to the fact that it did fail. When the AATF and the

AATG were still in the germ, so to speak, I opposed their formation as vigorously as I could. (See my editorials, *Modern Language Journal* 11: 485; 12: 427; 13: 509; 14: 595.) What I foresaw and deplored in advance has in large measure come to pass. The organizational urge in any professional body is definitely limited in range, and still more so in the number and effective force of those who are willing and able leaders. What has now happened is that our modern army has been split up into separate forces operating on different fronts. As a result, we are not pulling together, we are pulling apart, and this has given our avowed enemies, the educationists—together with all those who wish to lower educational standards out of deference to 'democracy'—an opportunity to spike our guns and drive us little by little out of the territory which is ours by more than one right."

"... Too often the financial aspect of this matter is ignored or underrated. Teachers have to count their pennies as carefully as other mortals. There is no question that subscriptions to the MLJ are cut down by competition with the other language journals. But without adequate financial support the editor is unable to do his best work. It is a pleasure to state that Handschin's energetic and successful conduct of his office went far to make possible for me the execution of the policies which our readers approved."

"While I freely admit the many fine things which the AAT groups have done, I still believe that from the point of view of our profession as a whole they have been and are a mistake, dissipating our energies, diluting our concentration, weakening our entire position. . . ."

In his editorial in *The Modern Language Journal* for March, 1928, Morgan gave a sympathetic reception to *The French Review* and *The German Quarterly*, both of which published their first issues in January, 1928, graciously accepting the inevitable and promising full cooperation. But his fears as to the divisive effects of the "one-language associations", as he terms them, seem never to have been allayed. In an "Open Letter to Teachers of Languages" issued in 1942, after sketching the educationist threat to liberal education, Morgan again appealed for organization on the local, state, and national level, the geographical basis that he had advocated fifteen years before, and added;

"It seems not impertinent to remind you, however, that as Managing Editor of *The Modern Language Journal*, when the AATF and AATG were about to be formed, I warned the profession that such a development would result in a dissipation of our energies and a consequent danger to the ideals which we uphold (see my editorials: MLJ 11: 485; 12: 427; 13: 509; 14: 595). Having watched the subsequent course of events closely, not without an unhappy sense that my forebodings were becoming a reality, I now feel it my duty to emulate the lighthouse keeper who sees a ship

laden with a precious cargo about to run upon a reef and be dashed to pieces."

Morgan's remarks on the geographical basis for organization (editorial in the *Journal* for May, 1927) are also worth quoting:

"A national organization of teachers can serve many useful purposes, and almost all subjects in our curriculum have been organized in this way. But the national body as such is bound to remain chiefly a paper entity, held together, if at all, by some form of publication which goes out to the members. The vital work of the organization is and must be done locally, not nationally, and the natural geographical unit, in most instances, is the state, although large states frequently have to section their territory. The chief reason why the state should be taken as the unit is that the fundamental organization, to which all these smaller groups can most effectively attach themselves, is already in existence: the state teachers' association. At no other time can so many teachers of any given subject be brought together as at the meeting of the state educational association."

"... The Spanish association is firmly established, and it may be confidently assumed that the new German and French associations will cling no less tenaciously to life. It is the duty of this *Journal*, which attempts to serve the interests of all modern languages alike, to cooperate with all three. But I wish to reiterate my conviction, to which I gave expression in our January number, that salvation for our cause does not lie that way. What we language teachers need is not to get apart, but to get together. It would be disastrous if energy devoted to the promotion of the one-language associations should result in the impoverishment of those undertakings which combine all the languages in a common endeavor for the good of all."

What now follows is wholly my own and based on experience both in the National Federation and in a "one-language association", AATSP, of which I have been a member since its foundation, and which honored me with its presidency in 1930. I have edited both *The Modern Language Journal* and *Hispania*—one of only three persons who have held the editorship both of the *Journal* and of an AAT journal. I also served as Associate Editor of *Hispania* for twenty years before becoming Editor, and as Assistant Managing Editor of the *Journal* during the editorships of Crawford and Morgan, including a brief period as Acting Managing Editor at the beginning of Morgan's term. I also served a term as Associate Editor of *Italica*. Spanish is my chief but not my only love. In my youth I taught both French and Italian (and in my first job, in a secondary school, Spanish, French, and German!). I have held three part-time appointments as Lecturer in French

Philology at The Johns Hopkins University. I have served as Secretary and President of the Middle States Association and as its delegate to the National Federation. It would be surprising, therefore, if I did not see both sides of the AAT problem, and it *does* become a problem when separatism is carried to extremes.

Since as early as 1926 the National Federation has consistently had on its docket the matter of the "two-journal" or "joint subscription" plan—based on the theory that the teacher needs both a general national journal of modern foreign languages—the unique place the *Journal* occupies—and the special national journal devoted to the particular interests of his major teaching field, be it Spanish, French, German, Italian, or a Slavic or Eastern European language. With this philosophy I heartily agree. But the "two-journal plan" has steadily come to grief on the rocks of AAT delays, reluctance and uncooperativeness. "It would make more work for secretary-treasurers" is only one of a variety of petty objections. Genuine cooperation would mean, of course, delimitation of the functions of the various journals and abandonment of overlapping content and advertising rivalry, a system I tried to bring about when I was Managing Editor of *The Modern Language Journal*, by referring certain contributions that lacked general application to the appropriate AAT journal. I also eliminated to a large extent "literary" or "research" articles, because I felt that the writers of these had ample facilities for publication in *PMLA*, *Modern Language Notes*, the *Philological Quarterly*, or for specific languages the *Romanic Review*, *Germanic Review*, *Hispanic Review*, *Revista Hispánica Moderna*, and others, including many European scholarly publications, which seem to welcome American contributors. All this *if* the contribution really had scholarly merit. When I became Editor of *Hispania* I again announced this as an editorial policy, placing the words "A Teacher's Journal" on the cover, and striving to print nothing that did not seem to be of interest to the classroom teacher, especially the secondary-school teacher. I was roundly abused for this policy by a few would-be contributors whose "research" had obviously already been seen and rejected by at least one editor of a scholarly journal.

An anomaly pointing up the reverse side of this situation is the fact that it is a commonplace to hear Romance or Germanic specialists complain about the dearth of articles from their fields published in *PMLA* as compared to the tremendous predominance of articles dealing with English or American literatures. It was not so in the "eighties" and "nineties" and in the early years of this century, when Romance and Germanic articles gave English "a run for its money", these critics say.

The answer is not far to seek. For one thing, there are more scholarly journals for specialists. For another, enough genuine research is not being done, or if done, is not submitted. That at least has always been the defense of *PMLA* editors, at times supported by statistics. "You send us the (Romance or Germanic) contributions", I have heard Percy Long say on several occasions, "and *PMLA* will print them".

Why would it not be possible to agree to delimit the areas covered by all our modern language publications—general, one-language, teaching, and research—in such a way that they would cease to overlap, to "undercut" each other in the matter of advertising support; and especially why can't we have cooperative joint subscription rates? It was disappointing, not to say depressing, to hear the delegate of my own language association, the AATSP, Lawrence Kiddle, who as chairman of a special committee on joint-subscription rates, made up of AAT delegates to the Federation, had made a loyal effort to achieve results, admit that he had run up against a blank wall of stubborn and petty opposition (the adjectives are mine) in the AATSP, apparently with similar if less completely negative reports from the other AAT's.

I am going to speak equally frankly about another anomaly of this particular situation. AAT's are constituent members of the Federation, with one vote apiece in the Executive Committee, which makes policy for *The Modern Language Journal* (with which their AAT journals compete—let's be completely frank—for advertising and subscriptions); sets subscription rates; elects the Managing Editor and Business Manager of the *Journal*; and authorizes expenditure of the Federation's funds, which are wholly derived from the *Journal*. The AAT's, however, do not contribute one cent to

the support of the *Journal*, directly or even indirectly (since they are apparently unwilling to cooperate in joint-subscription rates) and therefore to the support of the Federation.

Such "cooperative action for the common good" was formerly more characteristic. For instance, from 1937 on each of the four "old" AAT's contributed \$10 annually for a number of years towards the expense of the joint meetings, held in connection with meetings of the NEA, discussed later on in this paper. The major share of the expense of these meetings was borne directly by the Federation; in some instances our co-sponsor, the American Classical League, shared the expense equally with the Federation. In fairness it should also be pointed out that when the Federation's Committee on the Place of the Modern Foreign Languages in American Education was established, with an initial appropriation from the Federation of \$250, the AATSP contributed \$150, and the AATF \$50, towards the support of the nationwide work of the Committee, the publication of "Language Leaflets," and the other activities of the Committee.

Before I end this part of my "paper" I want to mention two other matters. One is the fact that a Committee on Revision of the Constitution and By-Laws presented last December a report suggesting minor changes in the constitution (largely to bring names of associations up-to-date), together with a thorough revision of the by-laws, which has been badly needed for a long time, and which contains some innovations. These revisions will come up for a first reading "vote" at the December, 1956 meeting of the Executive Committee. They deserve serious and thoughtful consideration in the spirit of "todos a una", to borrow the motto of the AATSP.

The other matter concerns the reserve funds—invested in Government bonds, in the savings account, or in the current checking account of the Federation—amounting now to more than \$10,000. These reserves have been built up over forty years by careful and economical management of the affairs of the *Journal* and the Federation, even by "penny-pinching"; by the tiny salaries, or "no salaries at all," paid to Federation or *Journal* workers as compared with "key people" in other associations; and

by a fierce determination to protect these funds in loyalty to those now gone who began to build them. I recently re-examined some of the correspondence between Professor Bagster-Collins, the first Managing Editor, and Professor Busse, the first Business Manager, sent by Professor Busse to Professor French for the archives some twenty years later. They are a revelation, almost pitiful at times, of meticulous economy and unselfish devotion. The same unselfish service and concern for the future have characterized—with one or two exceptions—all our Presidents and Secretary-Treasurers, all our Editors and Business Managers, from first to last. I salute them!

Certain characteristics of the Federation and the *Journal* are so striking that they cannot be over-stressed and should not be forgotten. The first characteristic I have already mentioned: the cooperation of many persons and groups in a common cause. The mention of the names of individuals in this account has been incidental and secondary to the emphasis on joint and common efforts; in fact, had space permitted, dozens of others could have been named with equal justification and with similar recognition of unselfish services rendered. I make general acknowledgment here, in the name of the Federation, to all of them—and what a long "Roll of Honor" it would have been could we have printed it in full!

The second characteristic is that the Federation and the *Journal* have never received one penny of subsidy or support outside of its own constituency, its own associations, its own subscribers, and—God bless them!—the advertisers in the *Journal*.

The final characteristic I would proudly stress, is that from the very outset, when the group of founders and sponsors personally guaranteed, out of their own slender resources as college professors and secondary-school teachers, a fund of \$1000 to ensure the first year of publication of the *Journal*, down to the present day, the work of the Federation and of its *Journal* has been carried on by men and women who have donated their services, working in their free time, in the evenings, on Sundays and holidays, and during vacation periods, while carrying on the work of their full-time jobs in schools and colleges. In the few

cases in which the Federation has tried to give them some financial recognition, the amount has been small, pitifully small in comparison with the substantial, even generous, salaries paid to secretary-editors or secretary-treasurers or directors of programs of other associations. The managing editor received for many years only \$200 a year, plus a problematical modest share of the surplus from operations of the *Journal*, provided the surplus exceeded a certain amount. This was for putting out eight issues a year, a task which includes reading and accepting or rejecting contributions; revising or condensing many manuscripts in order to make them more readable; reading proofs at least twice—in "galley" and in page-proofs; arranging his final material so as to utilize all space effectively, and particularly to avoid wasted "white space"; personally writing many of the "notes and news" items, or culling them from the daily press, educational magazines, or the library; "keeping after" contributors and recipients of proofs to meet his time-schedule; getting his "copy," galley-proofs, page-proofs, and "dummy" to the printers on time; answering correspondence, including letters from high-school and college students who want him practically to do their "research" papers for them (and even from some "Master's candidates," ditto); and finally doing over-all planning, and making sure each issue has variety of interest sufficient to appeal to a wide constituency—all this for a small "retainer" plus a possible addition from surplus, and with or without clerical help from his institution. A year or two ago the "salary" was raised to \$500 a year as a small but still insufficient recognition of these essentially "volunteer" duties. The business manager still gets \$200, plus a share of the surplus from operations that he himself has largely created by tireless solicitation of subscriptions and advertising—sometimes making a total amount less than what a professional advertising solicitor would charge for handling the advertising alone. The secretary-treasurer for many years received no salary at all; for the past twenty years or so he has received an "honorarium" of \$200 a year, for which he keeps the records; keeps the books; makes out and signs the checks; arranges the annual meeting of the executive committee; tries to keep interest

alive, or develop it, in local, state, or regional groups; makes speeches whenever time and his regular duties permit; answers mail, including "crackpot" letters, requests to recommend "the" school or college to which to send sons or daughters, requests for information about travel abroad, appeals for help in finding teaching jobs, requests for enrollment figures, and the growing plague of trying to answer letters for help on high-school "research" papers ("Please give me all the arguments for including foreign languages in the curriculum"; "Is Spanish more valuable than French?" or *vice versa*; and so *ad infinitum*).

Except for the three posts mentioned, the Federation pays "nothing to nobody." No contributor to the *Journal*, no associate or assistant or departmental editor, receives a cent for his work. The Federation does pay travel expense to its annual executive committee meeting, but that is for a selfish reason: it helps to ensure a full attendance and proper and undivided attention to the Federation's affairs. (For the same reasons, while the committee usually meets at the time and place of the "MLA" meeting, it tries to set a time of meeting as free as possible of conflicting MLA sessions or other competing demands on the committee members' time and attention. In recent years, the executive committee has met, successfully, on the day after the meetings of the MLA and associated groups—in short, "after everyone else has left for home." This undivided attention is the sole justification for paying (and accepting) travel expenses; regrettably, it is occasionally necessary to point this out to individuals or associations concerned.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION

The Modern Language Journal is of course the major publication of the National Federation. It has been published, without fail, *eight times a year*, in fair weather or foul, through two wars and a depression, irrespective of stresses of any kind.

Among other publications of the Federation two were published in 1932. The first was a 40-page pamphlet entitled *Vocational Opportunities for Foreign Language Students*, compiled by William Leonard Schwartz, Professor of Ro-

mance Languages at Stanford University; Lawrence A. Wilkins, Director of Foreign Languages in the New York City Schools; and Arthur Gibbon Bovée, Professor of the Teaching of French in the University of Chicago, in pursuance of a vote of the Executive Committee in 1930 setting up a special committee to make a survey of vocational opportunities for high-school and college students of foreign languages. The resulting pamphlet has sold steadily over the years. Its price was set practically at cost, with even lower rates in quantity. During World War II Government agencies bought it in large numbers for distribution to their trainees. At the 1944 meeting of the Federation's Executive Committee, the original committee was requested to revise it and bring it up to date. Because of the death of Mr. Wilkins soon after, the remaining members of the committee suggested that a new committee be appointed, and at the 1945 meeting the Executive Committee selected Theodore Huebener, Director of Foreign Languages in the New York City Schools, for the task, with an advisory committee, under his chairmanship, representative of the French, German, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and Slavic languages, as follows: Daniel Girard, Teachers College, Columbia University; Günther Keil, Hunter College; Vittorio Ceroni, Hunter College; José Martel, City College (N.Y.); José Frago, New York University; and Arthur P. Coleman, Columbia University (later of the University of Texas and now President of Alliance College). The much improved revised edition was published in 1946, with a third revision edition in 1949. It is still selling well (and being distributed *gratis* to high school and college educational counselors), in spite of the fact that Dr. Huebener, with permission from the Federation, has now compiled "on his own" for commercial publication a new and larger work.

The other early publication (also 1932) was *A Basic French Vocabulary*, compiled by Tharp, Bovée, Coleman, Eddy, and Jameson, and likewise sold practically at cost. It too had a steady sale, but ultimately was largely replaced by Tharp's commercially published *Basic French Vocabulary*.

The next publication of the Federation (1940) was a series of ten "Language Leaflets," of

which I was the editor. Sold at a low price, with reduced rates in quantity or in sets, the "Leaflets" have been surprisingly popular. They deal not only with the cultural and practical values—personal, national, and international—of foreign languages but with the importance of languages in science and in international trade. Among the contributors were Hon. Sumner Welles, then Under Secretary of State; Nicholas Murray Butler, late President of Columbia University; the late Frank C. Whitmore, Dean of the School of Chemistry and Physics, Pennsylvania State University; Dean Hayward Keniston, University of Michigan; President Henry M. Wriston of Brown University; Hon. Joseph C. Grew, former Ambassador to Japan; and two British professors, H. G. Atkins and H. L. Hutton, from whose standard work, *The Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in School and University* (published by Longmans, Green and Company) we were graciously permitted to reprint a splendid statement on "Humanistic and Practical Values of Modern Foreign Languages." An enlightened educator, former Dean Raymond A. Schwegel of the School of Education, University of Kansas, prepared a "Leaflet" entitled "A Psychologist Looks at Modern Foreign Languages." My own contribution, "Will Translations Suffice?"—an answer to the outworn argument that "We don't need foreign languages because everything worthwhile is available in English translation"—must have hit the mark, because it has been referred to, even by educators, as the "classic" statement of the case. Neither the editor nor the compilers of these "Leaflets" received any remuneration, and the same statement can be made of *Vocational Opportunities* and the *Basic French Vocabulary*. All were volunteer contributions to the cause.

The next publication was a pamphlet entitled *Suggestions for State and Local Committees*, prepared by Wilfred Attwood Beardsley and Henry Grattan Doyle, co-chairmen of the Federation's "Committee on the Place of the Modern Foreign Languages in American Education" and published in 1941 for free distribution to more than 280 state sub-committee members (and others) in each of the 48 states and the District of Columbia. Included in the pamphlet were suggestions for "telling the modern foreign lan-

guage story" by radio, in newspapers and magazines, in talks before clubs and other organizations, by exhibits in libraries and bookstores, and by interviews with superintendents of schools and other administrative officers. It also suggested the establishment of local "rebuttal boards," to answer misleading or false statements about the values of modern foreign language study, as well as urging close cooperation with local teachers of other fundamental subject-matter fields, i.e., English, Latin, history, mathematics, and science, for the defense of what Dr. W. C. Bagley, of Teachers College, Columbia University, another enlightened Professor of Education (also editor of *School and Society*), used to call "the exact and exacting studies." An extensive bibliography was included in the pamphlet. The committee also suggested the wide use of slogans, such as "Learn Languages for Your Own and Your Country's Sake," "Languages for War—and Peace," "Americans, Awake to Language Needs," and the like. These were used for a number of years in *The Modern Language Journal*, in the "AAT" journals, and in regional and state journals.

The Federation also subsidized the publication by the National Education Association of one of its "Personal Growth Leaflets," written by Edwin H. Zeydel of the University of Cincinnati while he was Managing Editor of *The Modern Language Journal*, under the intriguing title "Foreign Languages in School and Life." These NEA leaflets, sold for one cent a copy, were distributed in editions ranging from 20,000 copies up to 100,000 copies or more. Dr. Zeydel's brief, "peppy" statement is still worthwhile reading for any teacher or student of a modern foreign language.

Planning the Modern Language Lesson, edited by Winthrop H. Rice, was published "for the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers by the Syracuse University Press" in 1946. This book contains a series of papers published in *The Modern Language Journal* between December, 1944 and February, 1946. The authors, in addition to Professor Rice, included Lilly Lindquist, E. B. de Sauzé, James B. Tharp, Eunice R. Goddard, Louise C. Seibert, Walter V. Kaulfers, Harold Lenz, Ferdinand M. Labastille, Louis E. Sorieri, and Daniel P.

Girard. Although the contents of the *Journal* are not copyrighted and may be freely reprinted provided due "credit" is given, Dr. Rice generously insisted that royalties from the sale of this book be paid by the Syracuse University Press to the National Federation, and for a number of years annual royalty checks, at first substantial, later more modest in amount, were received from the publishers. (Incidentally, under a similar arrangement, D. C. Heath and Company has paid all annual royalties on the *Handbook for the Teaching of Spanish and Portuguese*, of which I was editor-in-chief, to the treasurer of The American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, these payments to be held in a fund to finance revisions of the book, whose bibliographies, especially, are now "dated".)

THE COMMITTEE ON THE PLACE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

Another activity sponsored by the Federation was its Committee on the Place of Foreign Languages in American Education, established early in 1941 (see *The Modern Language Journal* for April, 1941 and March, 1942, the "Jubilee Issue," and the *Suggestions for State and Local Committees*, discussed under "Publications"), State committees were set up in all the states and in the District of Columbia, with members as listed in the *Journal* for April, 1941. The first service these committees were called upon to render was to suggest teachers of Spanish for Army Air Corps fields and other installations, following General Arnold's directive that all Air Corps officers study Spanish. (This order was based on the assumption that the Nazis would ultimately attack the United States by way of Dakar, Brazil, and the Caribbean.) Classes for airmen were set up throughout the country, with volunteers obtained by the state committees and with over-all direction from Washington through a National Advisory Committee appointed by General Arnold, under my chairmanship. With the cooperation of the U. S. Office of Education and the W.P.A., a special textbook, *Conversational Spanish for the U. S. Army Air Corps*, was prepared by Messrs. Besso and Lipp. These classes, and the textbook, were so successful that the Navy also asked to "come in," and a second textbook, *Conversación*, was prepared by the same authors

with Navy cooperation, and used in subsequent classes, which included Navy personnel, as well as in the Washington Inter-American Training Center, already described. The above are of course only indirect results of the organized mobilization of language people in 1941, initiated by the Federation primarily for professional purposes, but which fortunately was available to help on national language needs in 1941 and 1942, both in the programs mentioned and in the ASTP (Army Specialized Training Program).

Naturally during the war years the original professional purposes of the Committee had to be set aside. The idea of state committees was however utilized again, following the war, in another project of the Federation, the "Committee on the Recruitment, Training and Placement of Modern Foreign Language Teachers," established in 1948 under the chairmanship of Professor Charles M. Purin, retired, of the University of Wisconsin. This project is described in the *Modern Language Journal* for May, 1949 and October, 1949, and the "Preliminary Report" of the chairman was published in the *Modern Language Journal* for October, 1953. The members of the committees involved all served on a volunteer basis, but the National Federation met most of the expense (for postage, mimeographing, and the like) of the survey directed by Professor Purin. The total amount expended by the Federation for expenses incurred in this investigation was about \$900. No one received any payment for services in connection with the survey. The materials collected by Professor Purin were first turned over to the Foreign Language Program of the MLA for study and analysis, but when Professor Purin learned that the "FLP of the MLA" had "committed all its funds and that the survey might have to lie over for a year or more before an analysis could be financed, he approached the writer (Professor James B. Tharp) with an offer to turn over the materials if the analysis could be financed at Ohio State University." This was arranged, and Professor Tharp's report, "Status of the Academic and Professional Training of Modern Language Teachers in the High Schools of the United States," was published in the *Journal* for October and December, 1955. The Federation is grateful to Professor Purin and to

the chairmen and members of the state committees, as well as to Professor Tharp and his aides, for unselfish service beyond the call of duty.

"LANGUAGE WEEKS" AND "LANGUAGE NIGHTS"

One of the activities that the Federation began to encourage early in its campaign to "Awaken Americans to Language Needs" in 1941 was the practice of holding "Language Weeks" or "Language Nights." These take various forms—talks, exhibits, colorful costumes, posters, *realia*, singing of foreign songs, dances, movies, performances of plays in the foreign languages by students, radio broadcasts, and in fact everything that teachers and students can think of to press home to parents, school administrators, other members of the community, and the local press that (1) language study is worth while and (2) that students enjoy it. The local public library is also enlisted in the campaign, and usually responds by exhibits of books. All the modern foreign languages usually participate *and* the Latin department is also a full partner in the enterprise.

Emphasis is laid on "language values" rather than on competition among the languages, as Miss Emilie Margaret White points out in her excellent article in *The Modern Language Journal* for November, 1943, in which she describes the Foreign Language Week planned by a committee, of which Miss White was chairman, for the Washington, D. C. public schools. Even the Library of Congress cooperated by exhibiting Latin, French, and German books from its Rare Book Room, including many *incunabula*, and the Hispanic Foundation also prepared a special exhibit of books and other materials. Dr. Beatrice Wall, of Miss White's committee, a teacher of Latin at the Taft Junior High School, subsequently wrote a highly interesting article in *The Journal of Education* for October, 1946 on "Language Week in Washington." Miss White early became chairman of the Federation's Language Week Committee, her fellow-members being Miss Mary Frost of the Denver High Schools, Miss Narka Ward of the Montclair, N. J. school system, and Miss Marguerite Zouck, Director of Foreign Languages in the Baltimore Public Schools (a post analogous to Miss White's in Washington), all of whom had

distinguished themselves in "Foreign Language Week" activities in their own localities. Miss White was succeeded as chairman of the Federation Committee by Miss Jacquetta Downing of the University of Wichita. When Miss Downing resigned in 1951 the movement was so well established in schools, colleges, and universities all over the country that it no longer needed the Federation's encouragement, for local and state committees, or local or neighboring universities, were very properly taking over the work. The University of Miami (Florida), for instance, put on excellent programs in 1954 and 1955, featuring the admirable slogan: "One language makes a wall: it takes two to make a gate." Another good program, though restricted to French, was held at Seton Hall College in 1949 (cf. *MLJ*, Oct. 1952).

"Language Night" is a one-day program, of which Miss Esther Eaton, of the Garden City (N.Y.) High School, is the good angel. Miss Eaton began her programs more than twenty years ago. She has found by experience that a "night" every two or three years is best, in view of the "terrific amount of work for the teachers, but it pays off in terms of the students," as she tells us in her article "Conversation—How?" in *The Modern Language Journal* for February, 1949. (I cannot forbear mentioning also the excellent syllabi—or syllabuses—for French and Spanish prepared for the Garden City High School under Miss Eaton's capable direction. Incidentally, she is a recent president of The Middle States Association of Modern Language Teachers.) I think her total of "Language Nights" is now about ten. Another excellent one-day program, called "Modern Language day," was put on not too long ago in New Brunswick, N. J. under the auspices of Rutgers University, with Professor Remigio U. Pane as chairman. College Avenue, the University's main thoroughfare, was converted into an "international boulevard" for the day, according to the *New York Times*, and 600 pupils and 100 teachers from 60 public, private, and parochial schools in New Jersey participated.

The Federation cannot take credit for the "Language Week" or "Language Night" idea. That credit belongs to hard-working and dedicated local teachers; but at least the Feder-

ation early recognized its possibilities and gave it a "boost."

JOINT CONFERENCES AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL
MEETINGS SPONSORED BY THE
NATIONAL FEDERATION

Superficial observers sometimes wonder when the National Federation annual meetings are held, and express interest in attending them. The "annual meetings" are of course meetings of the Executive Committee of the Federation whose duties, according to the constitution of the Federation from the very beginning, are primarily "to direct and control the publication of *The Modern Language Journal*, and take such other measures as are in the interest of the National Federation." The Executive Committee therefore serves as a sort of board of directors for the *Journal*, and its annual meetings as a result are "executive sessions."

This does not mean, however, that the Federation has not sponsored public meetings, national and regional, for many years. One of my first active roles for the Federation, while secretary-treasurer of The Middle States Association, was to serve as chairman of a meeting held on July 3, 1924 in connection with the "Summer" meeting of The National Education Association, at which the speakers were Dr. Charles R. Mann, Director of the American Council on Education, and Dr. Charles M. Purin, then at Hunter College, a member of the Committee on Investigation of The Modern Foreign Language Study. In 1934 I was a speaker at a similar meeting, held in Washington on July 3 in connection with the annual meeting of the NEA, at which the other speakers were Eunice R. Goddard of Goucher College, Emilie Margaret White of the D.C. Public Schools, David E. Grant of Pan American Airways, and William J. Cooper, formerly U. S. Commissioner of Education and then Professor of Education at The George Washington University. The chairman was Aaron McCoon, Englewood High School (N.J.), then president of the Middle States M.L.T. Assn.

In fact, beginning in 1931 and continuing annually through 1942, the National Federation sponsored conferences held in connection with the July meetings of the NEA, and beginning in 1936 also at the February meetings (formerly

known as the "Department of Superintendence, NEA", and now as the "American Association of School Administrators, NEA"). The regular procedure of the National Federation was to provide over-all sponsorship and to ask the regional or state constituent association in whose territory the meeting was held to assume responsibility for arranging the meeting, obtaining the services of the chairman and speakers, and publicizing the meeting. It was as the representative of The Middle States Association that I presided at the meeting mentioned. Even after war-time travel conditions suspended the February meetings in 1943, the Federation asked its regional and state constituent associations to continue to cooperate in its name by arranging conferences in connection with the July meetings of the NEA; and this was done.

Among a fairly long list of these February meetings, the following may be of interest: March, 1938 (Atlantic City), sponsored by the National Federation and the National Council for the Social Studies; July, 1939, San Francisco; July, 1940, Milwaukee; June, 1941, Boston (in conjunction with the New England Modern Language Association).

Between 1937 and 1942, inclusive, the Federation not only sponsored but financed, to the extent of \$100 to \$200 annually, a series of meetings, under the joint auspices of the Federation and the American Classical League, at the February meetings of the NEA, in New Orleans, Cleveland, St. Louis, Atlantic City, and San Francisco, with distinguished speakers from the ancient and modern foreign language fields, and an occasional broad-minded public school superintendent like the late Dr. David E. Weglein of Baltimore.

In 1937, following the publication of my editorial "A Call to Action" in the October issue of *The Modern Language Journal*, an open meeting was held in Chicago, jointly sponsored by the National Federation and the "AAT's", at the time of the MLA meeting (December 27-28). Professor Howard Mumford Jones, chairman of the MLA "Committee on Trends in Education Adverse to the Modern Languages and Literatures," and I were co-chairmen of these meetings, the speakers including such leaders as Hayward Keniston, Harry Kurz, Bayard Quincy Morgan, Lilly Lindquist, Jen-

nie Shipman (Woodrow Wilson Junior High School, Chicago), Josephine de Boer (Wittenberg College), and W. W. Blancké (South Philadelphia High School for Boys). Professor Jones's report for his MLA committee aroused enthusiasm. Out of these well-attended meetings came (indirectly) the Committee on the Place of the Modern Foreign Languages in American Education and the MLA Commission on Trends in Education, set up under my chairmanship in 1939 and of which I served as chairman until 1950.

A similar meeting was held at Indianapolis in December 31, 1941, with the slogan "Awaken Americans to Language Needs." Stephen L. Pitcher, President of the National Federation, presided, and the program included: a report from the co-chairmen of the Committee on the Place of the Modern Foreign Languages in American Education, presented by Professor Beardsley; an address by Richard Pattee, assistant Chief of the Division of Cultural Relations, Department of State; one by Henry Grattan Doyle on "The Future of Modern Languages in the United States"; and an interesting panel discussion on the topic "How Can Foreign Language Specialists Contribute to National Defense and War Effort?", the discussion leaders being Mortimer Graves, Administrative Secretary of the American Council of Learned Societies, and father of the Intensive Language Program of the ACLS, and Mrs. Stella Leche Deignan, Director of the WPA Army and Navy Spanish Project.

These joint meetings were discontinued during World War II, but resumed in 1948 at the MLA meeting in New York City, with a program on December 27 jointly sponsored by the National Federation and the AAT's, the speakers being Stephen A. Freeman and the recurring Henry Grattan Doyle. Freeman's masterly address "What About the Teacher?", delivered at that meeting, is a classic paper on the training of modern foreign language teachers. Published in *The Modern Language Journal* for April, 1949, it makes instructive reading in 1956. (Again, "How old the new!")

In 1949 the MLA met in Palo Alto, California, making impossible a joint meeting that year, and efforts to arrange meetings at New York in 1950 and in Detroit in 1951 also failed

because of AAT scheduling difficulties. Since 1952 the Modern Language Association of America has held teachers' meetings, clearing ample time in its programs for discussion and explanation of its Foreign Language Program, for which the Rockefeller Foundation made its initial grant in 1951. Separate Federation-sponsored public meetings, therefore, would have meant wasted effort, and none have been held. But the Federation undoubtedly will make itself felt in the same direction at any time in the future when duty calls.

HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE

The George Washington University
Secretary-Treasurer, National Federation of
Modern Language Teachers Associations

APPENDIX A

"MODERN LANGUAGE" (OR "MODERN LANGUAGES"):
A NEEDLESS CONFUSION IN USAGE

What does "modern languages" mean? To the British "Modern Language Association" and its publication *Modern Languages*, it means the modern *foreign* languages; to the "Modern Language Association of America," it means the mother-tongue *and* the modern foreign languages. The difficulty is sometimes met in Great Britain by the use of "modern humanities," as in the name of the "Modern Humanities Research Association," which in large measure parallels the interests of The Modern Language Association of America. Usage here in North America seems to show a preference, beginning in the last century, for the ambiguous "modern languages." Among local, state, and regional groups, The New England Modern Language Association, The Middle States Modern Language Teachers Association, The Central States Modern Language Teachers Association, and others of similar importance, are organizations of modern *foreign* language teachers; but The South Atlantic Modern Language Association covers both English and modern foreign languages. And so it goes.

"The Modern Foreign Language Study" of 1924-28, doubtless with a view to avoiding confusion, inserted "foreign" in its official name; but in its imposing series of publications writers and editors seem to use both terms indiscriminately. Handschin's pioneer *Methods of Teaching Modern Languages* (1923), although it carries a footnote on page 1 warning against confusion of The Modern Language Association of America, "composed mostly of college and university professors and devoted to research in literature and philology," with The National Federation of Modern Language Teachers, "composed principally of high-school and college teachers and devoted to problems of teaching," perpetuates a different kind of confusion by failing to point out the preponderance of teachers of English and American literature in the membership of the Modern Language Association and their complete absence from the National Federation. On the other hand, Cole's excellent *Modern Foreign Languages and Their Teaching*

(1931; revised by Tharp, 1937) makes perfectly clear by its title the field it covers. Among large state organizations, The New York State Federation of Foreign Language Teachers (formerly The New York State Modern Language Association) not only improved its name but made possible thereby the inclusion of teachers of the ancient foreign languages, a step that many modern foreign language teachers' organizations might well consider, since teachers of the Classics and of modern foreign languages—now that the “quarrel of the ancients and moderns” of nineteenth-century American education is fading into the mists of history—have so much in common.

But tradition, or inertia, dies hard. When The National Federation of Modern Language Teachers amended its name in 1945 by adding the word “Associations,” thereby clearly indicating its constitutional structure, I, at least, proposed also inserting “Foreign” between “Modern” and “Languages,” i.e., following the example of the “Modern Foreign Language Study.” But my motion failed to pass even in the Federation’s Executive Committee meeting. What would have happened if the proposed change had been submitted to the constituent associations for adoption is problematical. Secretaries of various associations, who are sometimes compelled to waste valuable time in correspondence defining such indefinite terms as “modern language” and “modern languages” as at present used would, I am inclined to believe, welcome a more definite, clean-cut system of nomenclature, especially if it were generally adopted, and consistently employed, in American educational practice.

APPENDIX B

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE ON THE HISTORY OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING

A useful summary of the general history of language teaching is contained in Buchanan and MacPhee’s *An Annotated Bibliography of Modern Language Methodology* (volume VIII of the publications sponsored by The Modern Foreign Language Study), published at Toronto in 1928 (Toronto University Press), Introduction, pp. 1–25. L. Bahlsen’s *The Teaching of Modern Languages* (Boston: Ginn, 1905) is also useful. For the history of modern foreign language teaching in the United States, the best detailed source up to its date of publication is Charles Hart Handschin’s *The Teaching of Modern Languages in the United States*, published as a “Bulletin” of the United States Bureau of Education (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1913), now out of print. Briefer sketches are available in Cole and Tharp’s *Modern Foreign Languages and Their Teaching* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1937), and Méras: *A Language Teacher’s Guide* (New York: Harper, 1954). Peter Hagboldt’s *The Teaching of German* (Boston: Heath, 1940) is, like all Hagboldt’s publications, an excellent book; the historical sketch of the teaching of languages from the Middle Ages to the present that introduces this work has been reprinted by Maxim Newmark in his *Twentieth Century Modern Language Teaching: Sources and Readings* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1948). Also available in Newmark’s fine volume are Otto K. Luedke’s “A Historical Review of the Controversy Between

the Ancient and the Modern Languages,” first published in *The German Quarterly* for January, 1944; “George Ticknor,” prefixed to my annotated reprint of Ticknor’s “Lecture on the Best Methods of Teaching the Living Languages” (1832), published in *The Modern Language Journal* for October, 1937; an article, “The Old and the New,” by James Geddes, from *The French Review* for November, 1933; J. R. Spell’s “Spanish Teaching in the United States,” published in *Hispania* for May, 1927; and E. O. Wooley’s “Five Decades of German Instruction in America,” from *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht* for November, 1944. The history of The Modern Foreign Language Study is recorded by Algernon Coleman in the introduction to *The Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in the United States*, volume XII of the publications of the Study (New York: Macmillan, 1929). The early years of the National Federation and *The Modern Language Journal* are reminiscently described in the “Silver Jubilee Issue” of *The Modern Language Journal* (January, 1941). Madaline Wallis Nichols has an excellent “History of Spanish and Portuguese Teaching in the United States” in *A Handbook on the Teaching of Spanish and Portuguese* (Henry Grattan Doyle, Editor-in-Chief), published by D. C. Heath and Company in 1945; and the *Handbook* also contains a splendid summary chapter on “Methods of Teaching a Foreign Language” by Marjorie C. Johnston and one entitled “A Look at the Future,” by the editor-in-chief. Copious bibliographies, now out-dated in part, are a feature of the *Handbook*. For Italian, Bruno Roselli’s *Italian Yesterday and Today: A History of Italian Teaching in the United States* (Boston: Stratford Company, 1935) is filled with information. Carl L. Johnson’s *Professor Longfellow of Harvard* (University of Oregon Press, 1944) is fascinating reading for those interested in the early days of modern foreign language teaching in the United States.

For pre-World War II developments, war-time activities, and post-war applications of war-time experience to modern foreign language teaching, the following are suggestions drawn from a wealth of material: Mortimer Graves and J. Milton Cowan, “The Intensive Language Program of The American Council of Learned Societies” (*Hispania* for December, 1942); the same authors’ “A Statement on Intensive Language Instruction” (*Hispania* for February, 1944); Henry Grattan Doyle, Director, *et al.*, *A Survey of Language Classes in the Army Specialized Training Program* (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1944); Robert J. Matthew, *Language and Area Studies in the Armed Services: Their Future Significance* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1947); and *Area Studies in American Universities*, by William Nelson Fenton (Washington: American Council on Education, 1947).

On the “Foreign Language Program of the Modern Language Association of America,” financed by generous grants from the Rockefeller Foundation, a large amount of material has been forthcoming for several years from the offices of the Association (6 Washington Square North, New York 3, N.Y.) including information collected by Kenneth Mildenberger on the progress of modern foreign language teaching in the elementary schools, a movement of long standing to which Dr. Earl J. McGrath gave new life by calling a conference on the subject under the auspices

of the U.S. Office of Education in January, 1953, while he was U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Dr. Marjorie C. Johnston, recently appointed Foreign Language Specialist of the U.S. Office of Education, is the author of an interesting "Report of the Conference on the Rôle of Foreign Languages in American Schools" (January 15, 1953), published in *Hispania* for May, 1953.

APPENDIX C

FEDERATION OFFICERS

Note: During the first three years of its existence (1916-19) *The Modern Language Journal* was published jointly by The Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations and The Association of Modern Language Teachers of the Central West and South. (Note the parallel in the use of "Associations" in the name of the original "Federation" and in the present name of the National Federation.) The associations composing the (purely Eastern) "Federation" included: The New England Modern Language Association; the New York State Modern Language Association; The New Jersey Modern Language Teachers Association; and The Association of Modern Language Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland. During this period of joint operation Professor Arthur G. Canfield, of the University of Michigan, President of the Central West and South Association, served as president of the temporary organization, a joint executive committee composed of four representatives from the East (the "Federation") and four from the Central West and South.

PRESIDENTS OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHERS ASSOCIATIONS

- 1919-21 William B. Snow, English High School, Boston
- 1921-22 J. P. Wickersham Crawford, University of Pennsylvania
- 1922-24 Starr Willard Cutting, University of Chicago
- 1924-25 Arthur Grover Canfield, University of Michigan
- 1925-26 John Driscoll Fitz-Gerald, University of Arizona
- 1927-28 Charles Winslow French, Boston University
- 1928-29 Wilfred Attwood Beardsley, Goucher College
- 1929-30 Albert W. Aron, University of Illinois
- 1930-32 Casimir D. Zdanowicz, University of Wisconsin
- 1932-34 Charles H. Handschin, Miami University
- 1934-36 Ferdinand F. DiBartolo, Buffalo Public Schools
- 1936-38 Lilly Lindquist, Detroit Public Schools
- 1938-44 Stephen L. Pitcher, St. Louis Public Schools
- 1944-46 William Milwitzky, Newark Public Schools
- 1946-48 Julio del Toro, University of Michigan
- 1948 Stephen A. Freeman, Middlebury College

- 1948-52 Charles M. Purin, University of Wisconsin
- 1952-54 Arthur P. Coleman, Alliance College
- 1954-56 Stephen A. Freeman, Middlebury College
- 1956- Fred L. Fehling, State University of Iowa

MANAGING EDITORS OF "THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL"

- 1916-19 Elijah W. Bagster-Collins, Teachers College, Columbia University
- 1919-22 Algernon Coleman, University of Chicago
- 1922-26 J. P. Wickersham Crawford, University of Pennsylvania
- 1926 *Ad interim* (October and November) Henry Grattan Doyle, The George Washington University
- 1926-30 Bayard Quincy Morgan, University of Wisconsin
- 1930-34 Charles H. Holzwarth, West High School, Rochester, New York
- 1934-38 Henry Grattan Doyle, The George Washington University
- 1938-43 Edwin H. Zeydel, University of Cincinnati
- 1944-46 Henri C. Olinger, New York University
- 1947-48 William S. Hendrix, Ohio State University
- 1948-54 Julio del Toro, University of Michigan
- 1955 *Ad interim* (January to May, inclusive) Julio del Toro, University of Michigan
- 1955- Camillo P. Merlino, Boston University

SECRETARIES OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

- 1919-26 Charles Hart Handschin, Miami University
- 1926-34 Charles E. Young, University of Wisconsin
- 1934-44 Charles W. French, Boston University
- 1944-46 Stephen L. Pitcher, St. Louis Public Schools
- 1946- Henry Grattan Doyle, The George Washington University

BUSINESS MANAGERS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL

- 1916-19 Adolf Busse, Hunter College
- 1919-22 E. L. C. Morse, Chicago Public Schools
- 1922-26 Arthur G. Host, Troy High School
- 1926-30 Charles Hart Handschin, Miami University
- 1930-34 Henry Grattan Doyle, The George Washington University
- 1934-38 George W. H. Shield, Los Angeles Public Schools
- 1938-46 Ferdinand DiBartolo, Buffalo Public Schools
- 1947- Stephen L. Pitcher, St. Louis Public Schools

* * *

It is important that Americans should get more familiar with modern foreign languages. The United States today carries new responsibilities in many quarters of the globe, and we are at a serious disadvantage because of the difficulty of finding persons who can deal with the foreign language problem. Interpreters are no substitute.

—JOHN FOSTER DULLES

* * *

On Teaching a Foreign Culture¹

THIS essay has a more novel and perhaps more exciting object than to lay out classroom procedures for those who may want to teach a foreign culture. In fact, I am not at all convinced that we are ready to say how to teach a culture, for I question whether we yet understand *what* to teach under that name. The fragmentary insights of all the humanistic disciplines and social sciences hardly add up to a lucid and coherent account, even for the nearby French or Hispanic culture. Before we get down to what is called "the" practical level of classroom operations, we strike a prior question of basic policy. *Should* a teacher of language and literature engage in teaching a foreign culture—particularly if that entails the additional commitment to organize a satisfactory substance for such teaching?

On our question of basic policy we differ. Now differences are a fortunate thing, an indispensable source of vitality and progress. But we need to distinguish between healthy diversity and destructive cross-purposes, which undermine a profession's collective achievement and public confidence. We are in danger of cross-purposes: the policy question before us opens up a divisive issue as to our very mission in society. I believe that the opposing views among us are not inevitably at odds, but can be reconciled on a certain common ground. The object of this essay is to try to define that common ground, in order that we may overcome cross-purposes and enjoy the full, constructive benefit of our wide diversity.

The issue whether language and literature teachers ought to teach the foreign culture was drawn with a new sharpness two years ago, as a result of the MLA Interdisciplinary Seminar in Language and Culture (*PMLA*, LXVIII:5, Dec. 1953, 1196–1218). This seminar proposed, in part, that the second college year or fourth high-school year of a foreign language be organized around concepts descriptive of the foreign culture. Critics of the report have replied that this would amount to teaching *about* cultures, after the manner of social scientists, in

place of imparting *culture* as befits humanists; in sum, that we would be "selling out the humanities to the social sciences."

The danger of weakening the humanities is real, and it has disturbed not only humanists but scientists, including some eminent physicists, political scientists, and anthropologists. Wherever the humanistic disciplines cross paths with the social sciences in our national society today, they seem to suffer an eclipse: in language-and-area programs; in the competition for financial support; in the very mentality of our students. Compare the large numbers of college students "majoring," that is, establishing the focal center of their outlook, in the social sciences, with the small numbers in language and literature, history and philosophy, even music and the fine arts. Those of us who purport to represent the humanities in American education decidedly need to represent them more effectually. And this I maintain we can do, by concerted, voluntary effort, provided we first hammer out a shared understanding of our mission as humanists, and a shared conception of culture.

What do we mean, then, by the claim that we cultivate the humanities? I think we can agree on one concern that distinguishes us, though we would not be able to agree on any definition that excludes all other interests, or other people. We would have to admit that every thoughtful, sensitive person is at least occasionally a humanist. Our distinctive concern, I believe, is to seek and *to value* the excellent in human creation or in human wisdom; and particularly, to discern the exceptional human excellence called greatness. We differ somewhat as to the relative

¹ This essay, presented at the Foreign Language Program session at the Modern Language Association meeting in Chicago, December 1955, summarizes some of the findings that are developed in a book on the university in a modern, pluralistic society, to be published by Harper and Brothers probably early in 1957. The greater part of the book was written during 1953–54, under the auspices of a Guggenheim grant.

emphasis we put upon descriptive knowledge. Some humanists give it equal importance with the concern that differentiates us; others regard it as secondary and wholly instrumental. But this need cause no conflict, if we agree that the humanist has potential use for all the knowledge relevant to man.

In contrast to the humanist's distinctive concern with valuing, the scientist's prime concern as *scientist* is to describe and explain the true, including the typical, which in human affairs is mediocre. It is not the scientific attitude to admire the object one studies.² But one cannot fully cultivate the humanities without seeking and appreciating the admirable.

Let us recognize immediately that the purviews of science and the humanities overlap extensively. The scientist chooses the significant, discards the insignificant, and so makes judgments of worth which take him into the province of the humanities. The humanist finds it necessary for *his* purposes to describe and explain the typical, and so he becomes concerned with factual generalization and statistical validity. As teachers of a foreign language, for example, even if our prime interest is the appreciation of great literature, we are actually engaged much of the time in determining and teaching what usage is typical within a certain level of discourse. To that extent we are drawn into what is essentially scientific activity.

But despite all that ought to be said about the overlap of science and the humanities, there remain basic differences of aim. One of these differences particularly concerns us here: namely, that science and the humanities organize knowledge for different ends. While the sciences pursue understanding within circumscribed fields of data, which moreover must be amenable to exact description, the aim of the humanities is the inclusive understanding called wisdom.

Scientific synthesis has the obligation to be exact, but no obligation to provide a complete basis for any action. Humane synthesis, whose purpose is wisdom, must assemble the best knowledge available—scientific where possible—concerning all the matters that bear upon the conduct of life, or specifically, upon a given choice, judgment, or attitude.

If this is true, does it not follow that the humanities rather than the social sciences ought

to be furnishing the interdisciplinary framework for such enterprises as language-and-area study, which combine both scientific and unscientific elements into a comprehensive basis for enlightened judgments and attitudes? To use the descriptive structure of science for this broad purpose is clearly a misuse, detrimental both to the pursuit of scientific truth and to the pursuit of humane wisdom.

I submit that it is no betrayal of the humanities, to accept from the sciences of nature and of society all their vast contributions toward the wisdom of man in our time. The fault has consisted in our collective failure as humanists, to devise and build a kind of synthesis that would rightly relate the humane import of science to all the other essentials of our culture at its best.

But can we agree on what we mean by culture? The term is used, even by us, in two very different meanings. According to the great tradition of the humanities and of education, culture is essentially a *process*. Alfred North Whitehead begins his essay, "The Aims of Education" (Macmillan, 1929), "Culture is activity of thought, and receptiveness to beauty and humane feeling." On the other hand, culture is essentially a *content*, or substance, for those humanists who define it as a "social legacy" or "the precipitate of history," just as it is for social scientists who define it in terms of "shared designs for living." Indeed the content concept—Germanists will recognize the *Substanzbegriff* discredited about 1910 by Ernst Cassirer—still dominates not only the popular "culture tests," but much of our classroom practice, which is bent upon imparting information and then testing for information.

I propose that the full meaning of culture always embraces both the process and a content, interacting upon each other. The "culture" of a person and the "culture" of (let me say) ancient Athens alike consist of an interplay between the process and a content.

The fact of interplay, moreover, has an important corollary. Culture is not just an *ag-*

² Some distinguished scientists consider that this sentence, however widely acceptable, restricts unduly the concept of science. The complex relation between science and the humanities is formulated at greater length in a book of mine soon to be published by Harper.

gregate of unrelated parts resting side by side. It is a functional system of interdependent parts: in a word, it is an *integrate*. Let me not seem to utter the old absurdity that "the whole is more than the sum of its parts." What I do say is that each component is to some extent modified, and its significance is expanded, by reason of its functional relationships within the integrate.

The parts are not all totally dependent, to be sure. Some works of art, for example, seem remarkably self-contained and transposable from their original setting to foreign cultures. Yet even the art symbol is transformed in some degree as it moves to a new culture and so participates in a new and unique pattern of meanings.

The completed concept of culture—as an interplay between process and content—brings together on a common ground the two partial conceptions which have approached it from opposite directions. Once this common ground is established, it suggests fruitful possibilities of further, more practical points of agreement concerning our mission as humanists and our special rôle as teachers of foreign languages and literature.

The full concept resolves the argument whether as humanists we impart culture, or *a* culture. The *process* of culture—the activity of thought and receptiveness—is universal to all humanity. Yet the *content* is inexorably dated and localized to a particular age and civilization. All culture by reason of its content has these limitations. The humanist therefore cannot quite claim that he is teaching culture *sub specie aeternitatis*, and so need have no truck with the factual description of cultures. For inevitably he belongs to *a* culture, and the great achievements he studies and teaches are parts of *a* culture. The best attainable understanding of the excellent, and of the judge's own yardstick for valuing it, depends partly upon accurate descriptive knowledge of the integral systems to which the achievement and the yardstick belong.

This confirms the proposition I advanced a moment ago, that the cultivation of the humanities today calls for collaborative, humane synthesis, drawing upon the sciences and all other sources of understanding that contribute to the wisdom of the age. When we apply the whole

concept of culture, relativistic with respect to content, our mission as humanists assumes an importance that we ourselves have not satisfactorily formulated. Modern, complex cultures are being broken apart by an unprecedented battery of disintegrative forces: notably the inevitable modern specialization; the clash of cultures and the necessary plurality of ultimate beliefs; the swift pace of technological and social history; and the increasing autonomy of the young generation's private sub-culture. To build the best of all this into a shared, cohesive culture is the central problem of our age; and assuredly it is no task for scientific synthesis. The problem faces squarely toward the humanists, with all its possibilities for the pursuit of greatness and all the dangers of betrayal by default.

How can we best coordinate our efforts to produce a humane synthesis within a modern pluralistic culture? My suggestion would be that our national associations and agencies devoted to the humanities, with the help of those devoted to the natural and social sciences, could coordinate a decentralized process of formulating the changing common content of our culture at its best, using some such categories as (a) the methods we consider valid for pursuing truth, (b) our world picture, and (c) our interrelated ideals, or "system of values." I would maintain that a humane synthesis of this kind can be carried on without misrepresenting the irreducible issues in the culture, and without encroaching upon the plane of ultimate explanations and sanctions, where we differ. Surely it would advance the understanding between peoples, as well as self-knowledge, if we could make comprehensible the essential content of each culture; for this would provide the basis for sound comparisons to show the essential similarities and differences from one culture to the next.

All humanists, including humane-minded scientists, have some part to play in such an effort to countervail the disintegrative forces of modern cultures, to reintegrate a modern mind.

But how do the completed concepts of the humanities and of culture affect the rôle of humanists who teach foreign languages and literature? Is it our function to teach the foreign culture? I suggest that in a very important sense, we cannot help teaching the foreign culture.

One reason is that since a culture is an integral whole, the language and the literary artworks we teach cannot be rightly understood except in relation to the culture's system of concepts and sentiments, in a word, the "themes" of the culture. Some of the themes will be verbalized principles and values; other themes will be elusive modes of thought or of feeling, expressed only in the presentational symbols of the imaginative arts. This has one consequence highly congenial to a humanist, for it means that no one can rightly understand any sector of a culture without taking into account those of its themes which are approachable only through the arts. But we must not forget the other half of the relationship between language, or art, and the culture as a whole: the significance of the separate symbol is modified by all the cultural themes that impinge upon it.

There is a second and independent reason why we cannot help teaching the foreign culture. As we teach a people's language or literature, we unavoidably form our students' ideas of that people's way of life. The factual curiosity of our students impels them to find answers to their common-sense questions in whatever we say, even if we were never to indulge in a single explicit generalization about the foreign people's values, or world view, or strengths or weaknesses. What is worse, our students are bound to practice the fallacy of judging any fragment of the foreign culture as though it were intended to fit into their own scheme, unless we are prepared to help them draw an informed comparison instead.

No one questions, I think, that misunderstanding between peoples is one cause of the precariousness in current affairs. Any teachers who must exert influence here, as we must, incur the obligation to give the most responsible and accurate understanding our age can produce.

This does not mean that we should quit teaching language and literature. Quite the contrary. No other materials permit us to combine so well a direct *experience* of the culture, required by its aspect as process, with the *knowledge about* the culture demanded by its aspect as content. But we must make certain that *both* the experience and the knowledge are the best we can provide.

In order to present the necessary knowledge,

we need not generalize in our courses about all the main themes of a culture. Even the controversial Seminar Report proposed only that a few especially telling themes should be selected (p. 1209)—and the selection could reflect our humanistic concern with greatness, by putting in the foreground the aspirations of a people. Many among us would choose *not* to organize a course around cultural themes. Many great teachers prefer, for example, to keep a mental checklist of the themes they want to discuss with a class, and present each theme wherever it serves to deepen the meaning of a work of literature or an idiomatic expression. Nevertheless, we must admit that to choose good literary texts, and arrange them in a course so that they will illustrate themes of particular importance in a culture, is one logical way of trying to fulfill our obligation toward international understanding.

That obligation is of course only a part of our professional responsibility. As humanists we are more concerned with refining the culture of our students than with describing the culture of a community. Yet the culture of the individual student is also an integrate, whose excellence will be marred by the deficiency of either the process or the content that enters into it. If only for the sake of the student's self-fulfillment, therefore, we should do our utmost to insure the adequacy of the ideas which our teaching will lead him to infer.

Obviously, no teaching procedures that we may adopt are going to make our understanding of a culture any more adequate to the complex facts. The most practical suggestion I can make for the improvement of our teaching, where it must relate language and literature to the rest of a culture, is that we take initiative outside the classroom to produce parts of the needed humane synthesis. One way a teacher could do this would be to organize a discussion group of specialists from different fields. The group might well decide to pursue the fascinating, interdisciplinary sport of hunting cultural themes. In any case the purpose of the discussions would be to contribute toward a deeper understanding either of the local culture or of a foreign culture, by carefully formulating some essential element of the culture's content.

Little "synthesis groups" of this sort could

be assisted in various ways from outside. National agencies could perform the clearing-house function; they could provide more serviceable categories for cultural themes than the bare rubrics I have called simply method, world picture, and values. Administrators of schools and colleges could help, by recognizing that group efforts to create needed substance for teaching are as important to education as our performance in the classroom. But the primary initiative must come from us, the teachers.

Language teachers, as I have tried to show, have particular need for the results and indeed for the process of such interdisciplinary discussion. We also have a special contribution to give, and the obligation to give it. For since we are specialists in the art of experiencing a foreign culture, as only the language enables one to do, we are in a position to clarify one of the most important and pervasive yet most dis-

turbing and difficult of all themes to be found in a contemporary culture: the theme of intercultural perspective.

The conclusion of the reasoning I have traced so briefly is that we teachers of a foreign language and literature must also teach a foreign culture—to ourselves, above all. For we need professionally a responsible and coherent understanding of both the foreign culture and our own. But what we need does not now exist. In order to bring it into being, we shall have to cultivate a novel, interdisciplinary aspect of the humanities. The stakes are high: either we are relegated to teach language as a tool and literature as diversion, or else we must make a major contribution to the intellectual leadership of our time.

HOWARD LEE NOSTRAND

University of Washington

* * *

From the Editor's Corner . . .

For well-nigh three quarters of a century, there has been a veritable ebb and flow of philosophies, with relevant methodologies, on the role and on the teaching of the modern foreign languages in our American schools and colleges. To control in any meaningful way their vast bibliographies is well beyond the range of any one individual; to find through the maze of them all, their many common denominators, is vouchsafed only to those who can objectively evaluate what they read in the perspective of time and—very important—experience. Only latter day pioneers, blazing trails on the frontiers of methodology, can be naively confident that nothing had been thought out, that nothing had been tried, and that nothing had been achieved before, let us say, World War II.

Be all this as it may, we hold it as axiomatic that no educational program or classroom technique can be better than the teaching staff charged with implementing it. In other words, the secret of success always lay and still lies in the *humanics* rather than in the mechanics, useful as these latter may be. Indeed, through the fluctuating emphases and the shifting enthusiasms in the never ending whirligig of aims and methods, the one constant is the human power behind the desk. In a very large measure whatever achievement has been recorded down through the years is due essentially to the efforts of the intelligent, well-trained, and devoted teacher.

Justly proud of its long and effective service in the cause of international understanding through the study of foreign languages and cultures, *The Modern Language Journal*, "devoted primarily to methods, pedagogical research, and to topics of professional interest," will continue to be receptive to significant contributions representing all schools of thought and especially to the exposition of teaching techniques validated by experience.

* * *

*The Role of the Modern Foreign Languages in Our Schools**

THE study of modern foreign languages has had a difficult career in this country. When the humanities constituted the foundation of a liberal education, modern languages disputed their right to existence with the classics and were finally accepted on the basis of being a more recent version. Only the languages which had an outstanding literature of their own were taught in the classroom. The end of the last century and the beginning of the present one eventually witnessed a general study of French and German, with Italian and Spanish as seconds. Modern languages had come to be accepted on their own merits: French as the language of literature and social refinement; German as the language of science; Italian as the language of music and art; and Spanish as the language of literature and commerce. So strong was the acceptance that for years both French and German were required for higher studies and research in any field.

The political feelings of the First World War brought a sudden stop to the study of German and the interest was shifted almost overnight to Spanish. Commercial possibilities created such a strong case for this latter language that it soon became the most popular one in our schools, rivaling French for first place.

The growth of our secondary school system caused a necessary broadening of objectives. The secondary schools were no longer simply college preparatory, but a terminal course for many students. As such they were called upon to prepare these students for their own community rather than for a professional career. Since a liberal education was no longer the sole objective, academic subjects were no longer considered indispensable. Foreign languages were a clear-cut example of academic subjects. Since they were no longer considered indispensable, they were no longer required of every student and enrollments began to drop. Moreover, since foreign languages do not lend themselves to simplification, these courses were con-

sidered inflexible and hence unsuited to a changing curriculum.

Thus began the decline of modern language study, a decline both in enrollments and standards of achievement. Since the indispensability was questioned, the duration of the course of study was curtailed. The fourth year in high schools gradually disappeared, the third year became less common, and eventually the two-year course became the norm. The inflexibility of languages made it impossible to reduce the minimum officially to below two years, but in actual practice many students dropped out after one year.

The Second World War brought a realization of the need for foreign languages in military situations. Consequently there was a sudden surge in enrollments not only during the war years in Army programs, but after the war in the universities. The surge did not affect the high schools however, because it had not affected our educational philosophy. When the direct influence of the veterans disappeared, the high enrollments disappeared also.

It is only in the last few years that educational leaders have become aware that any problem exists. Parents and civic leaders have noticed the discrepancy between the training in the classroom and the needs of the individual. Outside of the classroom there is an ever-increasing demand for foreign language training. Radio and television courses are quite popular, the sales of records and tape recordings are mounting, private language schools are flourishing. All these manifestations denote a need for language study, but at an age level where linguistic aptitude is at its lowest. So far the only level where any special attention has been devoted to the language problem by educational leaders has been the elementary school. Here language study influences child psychology

* Delivered before the meeting of the Central States Modern Language Teachers Association, May 5, 1956, Chicago, Illinois.

and has a *raison d'être* according to educational standards. But the need for language study as an integral part of educational philosophy has not made any appreciable headway. It is our purpose to see if the knowledge of foreign languages does form part of what we conceive to be the function of education. It may be that such knowledge does not contribute sufficiently to be included as a functional part of education. If so, foreign languages should continue to be an optional asset for the intellectual elite or a technical tool for the professional translator. If, on the other hand, the knowledge of foreign languages does form a necessary part of education for present-day life, then place must be provided for them at the expense of other subjects now in the curriculum.

Let us, therefore, reexamine what we mean by education. Education is the training of the individual to understand the factors which constitute the world he lives in, beginning with those which are closest to his personal experience and extending to those which are most remote. No one individual can understand all these factors, but all individuals put together can understand all the factors put together. Therefore society establishes a system of education in which all factors are accounted for according to the inclination of the individual and his usefulness to the community.

Closest to the individual are those factors which involve existence itself; therefore the most basic education is the training for survival. When the matter of survival is accounted for, the circle of interest extends to relationship with fellow beings. The next step in education, therefore, is the training for life in the community. The community involves not only the immediate circle which affects the individual by personal contact, but the ever-increasing circle which affects our life as a whole. In the complex life which we lead today the individual is influenced not only by what happens in his own immediate circle, but by what happens between cities, states, and nations. In fact, with the coming of the atomic age, he is influenced even by what happens beyond our earthly sphere. The function of education is to provide, through the individual, the composite knowledge of everything which affects mankind.

Education for survival is the basis of all other

education, for without the ability to make a living all other abilities become useless in our society. Admittedly, therefore, the first duty of education is to develop the aptitudes needed for living in one's own community. However, if that were the only purpose of education, there would be no point in devoting so much time to it. It would not take years of schooling to learn to drive a truck, build a fence, paint a house, or bake a cake. We evidently expect more from education than the ability to make a living.

Education is expected to adjust the individual to his community so that both can enjoy a richer life. With this purpose in mind we train our youngsters to observe nature, understand how things are made, learn where products come from, take part in local government, look back into history. Our educational system is doing a good job of preparing the young for life in their immediate community. In this respect our education is superior to that which develops aloofness from society.

However, in our anxiety to improve the immediate community we have cut education short of its goal. Beyond the immediate community lie the larger communities of the state, the nation, and the world. Our educational program must prepare the individual for life within the *complete* community and not merely the immediate surroundings.

We all realize that language is the vehicle of communication of ideas. If there were a universal language, there would be no problem; but since the world is made up of many languages, the only way that nations can exchange ideas is through the medium of one another's language. In a society where people group together merely for survival there is scarcely any need for exchanging ideas. In fact, in such a society there is no need for education. But in our complex society of today, where every major industry has world-wide implications, dealings with other nations become indispensable. We might well say that the lifeline of progress depends on communication, and communication depends on a knowledge of each other's language. If we bear in mind the total purpose of education, foreign languages cannot be considered merely cultural subjects. Single individuals can afford to get along without

foreign languages, but industries, communities, and the nation as whole cannot afford to do so. If our educational programs are planned for the welfare of the community (and they certainly should be), the conclusion is inescapable that they should make proper provision for foreign language study.

Are we thinking only of vested interests when we say that the nation cannot get along without foreign languages? Let us see. There is no point in reiterating the arguments about world trade. Practically every article in daily use is the product of a complicated system of imports and exports. Someone, somewhere has to know two languages in order for this exchange to go on. There is no point in reviewing the amount of travel done by Americans, which now has reached astronomical figures. There is no point in restating the arguments about diplomatic relations and world leadership. What we wish to consider here is *progress*, which logically becomes impossible without foreign languages.

The most spectacular progress of our day is in the field of science. At the lower levels it is quite possible to have a scientific career with only the native language. On the higher levels, however, scientific research has become so complicated that no progress can be made without a complete knowledge of the latest findings. The English language has no monopoly on the scientific mind. Without the ability to understand exactly what has been done in a particular field, there would not be enough knowledge to make further progress. To say that scientific research can be conducted through translation is to become absurd. If a translator had enough knowledge to interpret scientific research correctly, he should not be wasting his valuable time translating. Our national security requires that our composite scientific personnel be in a position to understand the research of other countries, regardless of language.

Whereas in the field of science we are at present the acknowledged leaders, in the field of international relations we are still amateurs. As a matter of fact, the world as a whole is only entering the beginning stages of the problem of international and human relations. Industrial and scientific progress have made such strides in recent years that the human beings involved have been relegated to the function of inani-

mate objects. Human relations constitute a problem quite apart from technical relations, and the field requires some concentrated attention before technical progress can be translated into permanent human welfare. The hope for posterity lies in the progress of international cooperation. The atomic age has left us no alternative. What used to be a fond hope or a visionary dream has now become a relentless obligation. If our educational system has the obligation to provide the men of science to ward off destruction, how much more of an obligation is there to provide the leaders in international relations in order to avoid the causes which lead to destruction? It becomes evident that in the two basic fields on which progress depends there is a fundamental need for somebody, somewhere, to know foreign languages, for only through a foreign language can the conference table replace the battlefield.

It is time, therefore, for our educational system to establish the study of foreign languages as an integral part of the curriculum. We have been accustomed to consider languages as a part of liberal education. Let us learn to consider them as an imperative for international relations and national security. This does not mean that all students should take up foreign languages as a career, no more than that all students should be scientists, bankers, industrialists, or what-have-you. It does mean, however, that our system should provide for the development of experts in foreign languages who can establish contacts with major nations of the world.—And you don't develop such experts with two years of a language!

To provide for the skilled few there must be a broad base of beginning and a process of elimination, as we have it in every other field. Certainly do not expect every beginner in arithmetic to become a mathematician, nor every beginner in biology to become a physician. Yet we believe that every beginning language student should become an expert or should not be in class at all. The expert is prepared by a carefully-planned program which develops the innate ability in the appropriate student and eliminates the one who has no aptitude.

If a foreign language is to be useful, it must be started at an early age and continued as a career. Is it really logical that in a nation where

there are 24,000,000 elementary school students, only 300,000 are being exposed to foreign languages? And until three years ago practically nobody was even being exposed? The elementary school should serve as the broad base of a pyramid of instruction where the largest number have their first contact with a foreign language. Some of the children will show aptitude and continue their study; others will show no aptitude and go into other fields instead. But without such a broad base at the elementary level we cannot expect to develop experts at the higher levels.

If our reasoning about the purpose of education is sound, it becomes essential for those responsible for the elementary school program to make adequate provision for such study in the curriculum. Until the necessity for languages is recognized as an integral part of education, the elementary programs cannot help but remain on a wobbly foundation. Once the need is recognized, time will be found in the curriculum, the same as it is found for all the subjects which go to make up a complete personality.

At the elementary level classes of about twenty minutes a day are sufficient to introduce a language to children at the age when they are most receptive. If classes are begun in the third or fourth grade, there can be no fear of hampering the child's knowledge of English. The program at this level will serve to dispel fear and inhibitions regarding what is foreign. It will serve to develop new phonemes in the child's makeup and an aptitude to recognize, analyze, and reproduce the sounds of a new language. It will serve to develop conversational fluency, upon which the child can draw later on. The elementary school program should serve to open the door to bilingualism.

The languages offered in the elementary grades should be French, Spanish, or the language of predominant interest in the community. It is important for the child to feel that others are experiencing what he is experiencing; therefore one language in a school is preferable to several. The more practice the child can get with his friends or at home, the more he will learn to accept the foreign language as a natural part of his education.

Formal study of the structure of a foreign language should start in the junior high school,

with a definite choice of the language which the pupil wants to know. The junior high school course should furnish all the basic vocabulary and the essential grammar of the new language. Grammar is to be construed as an understanding of how the language works and not as the memorization of rules. The student should be trained to understand normal speech and to express himself clearly in ordinary situations. The junior high school will be the level at which correct speech habits and conversational fluency are developed on a permanent basis. The languages taught will still be the major ones: French, Spanish, or the language of predominant interest in the community. It is important to keep the community uniform, so that pupils can communicate with one another in their new language.

At the senior high school level the student will solidify and enlarge his knowledge of the new language. The objective can be nothing short of fluent use. If the student has overcome the difficulties of confronting a second language in previous training, he can now safely tackle a third language. The brighter students can branch out into the Slavic or the Asian languages.

It is the responsibility of our educational system to develop students who know foreign languages, whether they are going to college or not. A foreign language is a valuable economic asset for private industry, government work, and countless other jobs. We have been too prone to consider a foreign language as a natural endowment which one either possesses or does not possess. There has been a feeling that it is hopeless to try to learn a new language; one can never compete with a native. This attitude has been encouraged even by teachers of foreign languages, who have come to despair of obtaining results in the present educational system. Yet in spite of conditions and attitudes the fundamental problem still remains: a knowledge of foreign languages is a necessity and not an intellectual luxury.

At the college level we should develop experts who can really work with foreign languages without limitations. The measuring of knowledge by credit hours rather than by achievement is not only useless but detrimental. A person is either able to work with a language or his knowledge is useless to the community.

There may be other intangible personal benefits to be derived by contact with a foreign culture, but in so far as the community is concerned, you either know a language well enough to put it to use or you do not know it at all.

Colleges should train experts not only in the more popular languages such as French, German, Spanish, or Italian, but the less popular ones such as Russian, Portuguese, Japanese, Chinese, etc. We have made some progress in this direction since World War II, with centers of Asian, Near East, Slavic, and other studies, but such centers are few and far apart. The total number of experts developed by our educational system in the major languages of the world is still minute. It is difficult to think of experts when out of a total college population of over two and a half million, about four hundred thousand are enrolled in all the languages put together, and a good third of these are first year students. We can scarcely feel that our educational system is providing the needed training in this field.

Apart from the requisites of modern society, let us consider the needs of the individual in terms of intellectual development. Education is a broadening of the mind both geographically and historically. Since our present civilization is the result of centuries of development of Man's ideas, we cannot really understand it without understanding its background. Whether we consider the background in geographical or historical terms, we cannot help but run into the cultures of peoples who speak languages other than our own.

A knowledge of foreign languages is indispensable for the study of other people; but it is indispensable most of all for one's own personal development. Our educational system has a duty not only toward the average individual, but toward the superior mind. The gifted pupil is the forgotten entity in our schools. Those who are endowed with intellectual curiosity have a right to a training in the aesthetic things of life. Literature, music, and art may seem super-

fluous to the prosaic, mediocre, man whose only ambition is to make a good living, but they are the staff of life to the superior mind. To such people the study of foreign languages opens vistas which are inconceivable in a single-language education. If we believe in education at all, we believe in education as an enrichment of one's personality. Therefore, if for nothing else, our educational system should make definite provisions for language study as an enrichment program for the gifted child.

If our logic is sound, the function of modern language study in the United States educational system is clearly established. It is important, however, that those responsible for the system appreciate the need to the extent that they place it above other needs. It is neither the difficulty of foreign languages nor the quality of students which is the real stumbling block; it is the lack of conviction.

The complications of modern society require more complex education than was necessary heretofore. Not everyone can absorb the more complicated training; hence the need for a broad enough base in the beginning, with a gradual narrowing as the training progresses. At present it is evident that in the field of modern languages we are not equipped to develop the necessary personnel. If there were much elimination in the present classes, there would be no classes at all. The fact that accidentally we manage to get along without such trained personnel does not cancel the need or the obligation. Modern language teachers have a duty over and above the teaching of an individual language in the classroom. The duty is to work more and more toward convincing civic and educational leaders that a well-planned program of modern language study must be made an integral part of our educational system at all levels.

VINCENZO CIOFFARI

Modern Language Editor
D. C. Heath and Company

* * *

Names are magic. One word can pour a flood through the soul.

—WALT WHITMAN

* * *

Ferdinand de Saussure—Forerunner of Modern Structuralism

IN THE realm of linguistic theory the name of one scholar stands out with special brilliance, for much of the theoretical foundation of modern structuralism stems from Ferdinand de Saussure's formulations of linguistic principles. For one of several reasons there seem to be a lack of first-hand acquaintance with the work of this great Swiss savant among many language students, especially the younger ones. Although all pay their respects, few seem to know precisely why homage is required. It is the purpose of this article to examine a few of Saussure's ideas which have proved of prime importance in establishing the theoretical foundation of modern descriptive linguistics.

Ferdinand de Saussure (1857–1913), for many years professor of linguistics at the University of Geneva in Switzerland, believed that all historical research and philosophical generalizations dealing with language had to proceed from descriptive studies. He maintained that the first task of linguistics was to find out the facts of language. Two of these facts stood out in bold relief; meaning changes and sound change. Saussure set about trying to arrive at an empirical system by which these two types of change could be described. He was not wholly successful. Unfortunately, he never wrote a book giving us in detail the results of his life's work. After his death, however, several of his most prominent students published his university lectures from the notes they had taken in class. These lectures appeared under the title *Cours de Linguistique Générale* (Paris, 1915). Had Saussure lived to write and edit his own book, he undoubtedly would have clarified the presentation and given his material in a more connected fashion. Nevertheless, his theories and his methods of analyzing changes in meaning and sounds are essentially clear, even though certain passages are not without obscurities and even inconsistencies. We shall first discuss what he had to say about the

meaning of words and the method he evolved for treating this most illusive of all linguistic subjects.

Language Saussure defined as a two-fold thing: 1) An inherited social system of arbitrary signs, and 2) the active individual use of that system. "Sign" (word) he defines as the bond joining a concept and an acoustic image. The sign is "arbitrary" because the meaning of a word is not inherent in the sounds comprising that word but depends solely upon the conventional use of the word by the community. These arbitrary signs, Saussure maintains, tend by their very nature to be immutable, that is, not subject to change. There is, first of all, the compelling correspondence between concept and acoustic image—the one will always call forth the other.* Furthermore, since the linguistic sign—the bond between concept and image—is arbitrary (conventional), there can be no logical or necessary compulsion to change the word.

And yet words *do* change—in both meaning and structure. Why? With reference to meaning (we shall discuss sound-change later), reasons Saussure, not because the concept or image has changed, but because the bond *between* the two has somehow become *relaxed* or *displaced*. Meaning, as Saussure defines it, refers to the concept as the counterpart of the acoustic image, the two elements combining by some obscure process to form the linguistic sign (the word). The workings of this mystery lie hidden deep

* The following illustration may be of limited assistance in understanding this admittedly difficult statement: a musician has a "concept" of pitch or vibration. He also has an "acoustic image"—a sound picture—of a certain specific pitch or vibration which he has acquired by long practice. In order to correlate the two, however, he needs a "linguistic sign"—a word. The word selected for this particular acoustic image (selected quite arbitrarily by the speech community) is, say, Middle C. Thus, the linguistic sign joins—for purposes of communication—the concept and the image.

within the delicate convolutions of the brain. To systemize the abstruse workings of the human mind was beyond his province as a linguist, but he could catalog and systematize the *uses* to which the verbalizations of thought were put. In order to do this, Saussure makes a subtle but very important distinction between *meaning* and *value*. The latter he defines as the use to which the linguistic sign is put relative to all the other signs in the language. That the distinction is not just a philosophical loophole may be shown by an example. The English word for sheep is, in Spanish, *carnero*, in French, *mouton*. All three words have the same meaning but not the same value, for English *sheep* refers to the live animal; *mutton* is used to denote cooked meat. This distinction does not exist in Spanish or French. Since English *sheep* has the concomitant form *mutton*, its value is different from *carnero* and *mouton*.

What does Saussure accomplish by this rather fine-spun distinction? Simply this: he establishes a systematic, objective method of investigating change of meaning as reflected in usage. What had been speculation he raised to the status of a science. In other words, he evolved a system whereby it was possible to deal with facts. *Why* had the meaning of a given word changed? The ultimate reason in terms of unknown and even now unfathomable psychological processes was still a mystery, but such questions as *how*? In what areas? In what sort of linguistic environment?—these questions could be answered by the laborious but straightforward method of comparing *usages* and noting all similarities and contrasts.

Saussure conceives of linguistic events as occurring on two distinct planes, the study of which he terms "static" (synchronic) and "evolutionary" (diachronic) linguistics. In order to describe the former he speaks of an axis of simultaneous events, whereas the latter he refers to as an axis of successive events. Synchronic linguistics is the study of language or, more properly, of the particular phenomena of language on the same time-level, while diachronic linguistics is concerned with these phenomena through successive periods of time. The one is descriptive, the other is historical. On the basis of this division Saussure is able, at least in theory, to make another distinction.

Although admitting analogy and agglutination as contributing factors, he believes most structural changes in language have their origin in sound-change. Such formal variations, according to Saussure, are due to a breakdown in relationship (that is, a change in value) resulting from a phonetic change. The latter, however, is in principle a historical or diachronic event that takes place entirely without intention on the part of the speaker. Each generation of speakers uses the same general sound-pattern and no one perceives that certain classes of sounds are "drifting" away from a previous norm. Old English *stān* has become Modern English *stone*, and yet the shift was so gradual that no generation was aware that it was changing anything. The "state" of a language at any particular point in time, therefore, is fortuitous. Synchronic events, on the other hand, are always significant and indicate a conscious selection between two or more structural or lexical possibilities (a change of value).

The practical worth of this distinction lies in the precision of methodology it requires. Synchronic linguistics is above all the study of usage as reflected in the spoken language; diachronic linguistics is mainly the study of phonetic change as mirrored, however imperfectly, in the phonology of written records. If we accept Saussure's major premise that change in *sound* is ultimately responsible for change in *form* (directly wrought by a weakening of the bond between concept and acoustic image), then it becomes quite possible to correlate the two in a systematic, pertinent manner. The end result of comparing these two lines of development is a full description of a given linguistic situation at any chosen point of intersection.

With respect to phonetic change, too, Saussure is not able to answer the fundamental question of *why*. But *how* sounds change can be stated quite objectively by comparing successive chronological stages of a particular language or dialect. This regular, thorough-going process of phonetic change he then accepts as the mechanism which precipitates most of the subsequent changes in form and meaning.

Saussure stands at the beginning of the twentieth century as one of the greatest theoretical linguists of our era. There are, of course,

many who do not accept his mechanistic explanation of linguistic change, nor is it possible in practice to adhere to a complete separation of his diachronic and synchronic phases of investigation. His great service to linguistics, though, is that he laid the theoretical basis for an objective, controllable method of analyzing

language. His *Cours de Linguistique Générale* is still an indispensable text to the student who is interested not only in the techniques of language investigation, but also in the origin and evolvement of modern linguistic theory.

JOHN T. WATERMAN

University of Southern California

* * *

TO THE UNKNOWN TEACHER

And what of teaching? Ah, there you have the worst paid and the best rewarded of all vocations. Dare not to enter it unless you love it. For the vast majority of men and women it has no promise of wealth or fame, but they to whom it is dear for its own sake are among the nobility of mankind. I sing the praise of the Unknown Teacher . . .

Famous educators plan new systems of pedagogy, but it is the Unknown Teacher who delivers and guides the young. He lives in obscurity and contends with hardships. For him no trumpets blare, no chariots wait, no golden decorations are decreed.

He keeps the watch along the borders of darkness and leads the attack on the trenches of ignorance and folly. Patient in his duty, he quickens the indolent, encourages the eager and steadies the unstable. He communicates his own joy in learning and shares with boys and girls the best treasures of his mind. He lights many candles which in later years will shine back to cheer him. This is his reward.

Knowledge may be gained from books, but the love of knowledge is transmitted only by personal contact. No one has deserved better of the Republic than the Unknown Teacher. No one is more worthy to be enrolled in a democratic aristocracy—

"King of himself and servant of mankind."

—HENRY VAN DYKE

* * *

Testing the Language Arts

DURING the last half century, the ideal of objectivity in the judgment of human aptitude or achievement has tended to lead to the elimination both of the essay test and of the oral examination. It is ironic that these forms of testing persist universally only at the Ph.D. level. Apparently we mistrust objectively scored tests when we feel that really important decisions are required. Yet, do we really feel that decisions at lower levels, say at college entrance or during the freshman and sophomore years, are not of great importance to the individual? Certainly the ideal of objectivity is a worthwhile one, since whenever we must pass judgment upon other human beings we would wish to be as impartial as possible. However, in our enthusiasm for the "New Science," we have tended to apply techniques for objective examining wholesale, just as physicians tended to the overuse of penicillin in the early days of the "miracle drugs."

It is not the purpose here to attack objective examinations as such. In many instances they have proved to be more accurate and more efficient than essay tests; indeed, the writer has made his living during the past six years constructing such examinations. However, before the examiner can build a test, he must ask himself and his fellow teachers certain questions which *must* be put in the order of their importance. He must ask first, what are the aims of instruction; he must ask second, by what various means can these particular aims be evaluated; and, third, how can these aims be evaluated adequately with the highest degree of objectivity. It is important to emphasize that the test-maker must ask these questions in the correct order, since it is clearly more important to evaluate the proper aims of instruction than it is to be highly objective while evaluating irrelevant aims.

The argument against the essay test was launched in American education in 1912 by Daniel Starch and Edward Elliott.¹ These investigators uncovered the startling variations

in grading among teachers when reading the same essays. Other investigators during the Twenties and Thirties achieved results which supported the conclusions of Starch and Elliott. As a consequence, the essay examination, *even for the purpose of evaluating writing competence*, finally disappeared from national examining in 1942, when the College Entrance Examination Board abandoned it.²

The psychological climate of this period so favored the quest for objectivity that the important questions which an examiner should ask before he builds a test came to be reversed, and the third question, how can educational aims be evaluated objectively, came to assume the first position. The first question, what are the aims of instruction—clearly the question with which teachers are most concerned—became the least important of all. Since teachers of language have never pretended to be experts in the achievement of scientific objectivity, they abdicated during the Thirties their right to evaluate the results of their own teaching, because of the attacks made on their competence by educational specialists. Testing, for the most part, was taken over by "experts" in evaluation, who were only vaguely conversant with the aims of instruction, but who came to be extremely ingenious in the construction of tests. These experts reported the results of their tests in terms of statistical analyses, meaningful to other testing experts, unfortunately incomprehensible to the classroom teacher, and often irrelevant to the aims of instruction.

The makers of objective tests worked eagerly in every field. They produced some excellent tests, and they produced some very poor ones. Because they had failed to ask the question of educational aims as a *first* question, they fre-

¹ Daniel Starch and Edward C. Elliott, "Reliability of the Grading of High-School Work in English," *The School Review*, XX (September, 1912), 442-57.

² Claude M. Fuess, *The College Board: Its First Fifty Years* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950), pp. 156 ff.

quently produced tests quite irrelevant to classroom problems. Their tests of language ability suffered as a result.

Language is a way of expressing one's individual view toward his universe, both inner and outer. The symbols which he uses—words—are for the most part dictated by human convention, and the relationships into which he places these symbols—grammar—are also dictated by convention. Yet each individual is unlike any other individual and must find some way of expressing his uniqueness, if he is to realize himself as a personality. His chief means for self-realization is language, and surely the primary aim of language teachers is to develop this freedom in the student.³ However important the development of such minimal essentials as grammatical correctness or precision of vocabulary, these mechanics of expression are surely secondary. The free individual does not see his universe in a conventional way, in the same way that everyone else in his society sees it; he is able to have some reaction, some perception, perhaps some insight, which is his own, and which he can express only in some combination of linguistic symbols that goes beyond mere everyday language. Most of us during most of our lives allow our thoughts and feelings to be regimented by the particular ways that conventional grammar and word meanings dictate. We express our experiences in "everybody's language," and as a result they become everybody's experiences. Our reaction to a sunset, to a personal love, to an insight, is mostly set for us in advance by the conventionalized symbols into which we must perforce couch these experiences. Not only are we so directed at the point of communication, we are usually so directed even before the experience has taken place, and at the point of communicating it as an inner thing to ourselves.⁴

Surely the prime aim of language teaching is to attempt to develop in the individual some flexibility in his differentiation of his universe of experience as *he* perceives it. This is especially true since evidence from such varied research as that carried on by Kurt Goldstein in organismic biology, Wolfgang Kohler in his field theory of perception, Benjamin S. Bloom in the nature of problem solving among college

students, and Carl Rogers in psychotherapy, makes abundantly clear that the individual's capacity for problem solving both at the technical and common sense level is closely connected with his achievement of a free, non-stereotyped use of language. The mastery of a second language may be most useful in freeing an individual from the notion that all experience must be channelled into the cramped confines of the lexical conventionalities or grammatical rules of his native tongue. In fact, instruction in the native tongue itself may serve to enslave, rather than to free the individual, if it does not go beyond a mere knowledge of the grammatical rules, resurrected in the 17th century, enshrined in the 18th century, devoutly followed in the 19th century, and, one might hope, re-buried in the Twentieth.

Yet it is only the mastery of this petrified grammar which objectively scored tests of English may claim to measure. The ability to differentiate one's universe as he sees it individually, a liberalizing, freeing ability, cannot be measured by objective means. To evaluate an individual's level of success in seeing his universe from his own rather than from "everyone's" point of view certainly must involve a creative effort rather than an effort of recognition on his part. Objective tests of language necessarily must be produced in terms of what I have called "everybody's language"; that is to say, the banal conventionalities into which the half-dead adult forces the stream of his everyday experience are the only source for the responses of each item of such a test. Were "correct" responses to an objective test based on the test-maker's own reactions to the universe, the person taking the test would be penalized, since it is unlikely that his own individuality would coincide with that of the test-maker. At best, such tests can only measure how well an individual has adapted himself to the various levels of conventional lan-

³ See Kurt Goldstein, *Language and Language Disturbances* (New York: Grune and Stratton, 1948), p. 23.

⁴ For an interesting corroboration of this notion, developed, not in terms of language behavior, but in terms of the nature of memory, see E. G. Schachtel, "On Memory and Childhood Amnesia," in *A Study of Interpersonal Relations*, ed. Patrick Mullahy, pp. 3-49 (New York, N.Y.: Hermitage Press, Inc., 1949).

guage. These tests can never measure—and indeed they never set out to measure—the extent to which the individual has learned to use language as a means toward self-realization, and hence as a real tool in problem-solving. Educational decisions about the individual made on the basis of tests of this kind may well be costly errors.

Let us look again at the objections to the essay test. These are: (1) essay tests cannot be scored with reliability, that is, they cannot be read consistently by different readers and consequently, we cannot trust their scoring, and (2) essay tests themselves are not reliable measures of writing competence, that is, students may vary beyond reasonable limits of tolerance in their writing performance from time to time. Of late, a third objection, not earlier mentioned, has been raised by the Educational Testing Service: essay tests are not *valid* measures of writing ability, that is, they do not even measure the ability to write.⁵ These three objections to the essay test should be seriously considered in order to determine whether a free response test is a satisfactory means of evaluating language competence. The first objection, that the essay cannot be read reliably, is certainly a substantial one. The findings of Starch and Elliott and of subsequent investigators represented very accurately the kind of situation in which test-makers found themselves. Unfortunately, the efforts to improve language testing, which followed from the clarification of this problem, were almost entirely directed toward finding means of testing language ability in more or less objectively scored ways. Little effort went into the improvement of the essay test itself.

The first major effort to improve the reliability of judging essays was the development of writing scales; that is, a series of essays written in response to a set essay topic and ranged by supposedly regular intervals from "Really Excellent" to "Nauseating" against which the teacher could presumably compare the essays of his own students.⁶ These writing scales failed to improve significantly the consistency of judging essays, since the students themselves refused to cooperate: they rarely wrote essays which resembled the scaled models. Attention was then turned to the development of objec-

tively scored tests of writing competence, and during the Thirties, a tremendous amount of effort went into this project. It is unfortunate that the real problem posed by Starch and Elliott, that is, how to improve the consistency of essay reading, was for the most part ignored. Actually the search for objectively-scored tests of language abilities comprised a reversal in the order of the three important questions which a test-maker should ask: the emphasis came to be upon the objectivity of the test and the question of the aims of instruction came to be increasingly neglected. One should remember, of course, that this work was done in the context of the development of mass public education, and as a consequence, the emphasis tended to be more upon method than upon outcome.

However, during the last decade, the situation has altered. Even as the predominant theoretical basis of educational psychology has shifted from stimulus-response or behavioristic psychology to gestalt or organismic psychology, so has the emphasis of educational planners shifted from a preoccupation with method to a consideration of curricular content and educational outcomes. By now it has become possible to return to this problem with a somewhat more humanistic view. The question of agreement among readers of essay tests can be approached directly only if one is willing to assume first, that language competence can be tested by no other means than by requiring creative performance on the part of students, and second, that, though human judgments will necessarily vary, they cannot be supplanted by mechanical operations. This approach puts our three questions back into their proper order. As a result, we must devote great effort to the setting of the test problem and confine our search for objectivity to its proper place: the task of training teachers to judge free response tests as reliably as possible.

⁵ Richard Pearson, "The Test Fails As an Entrance Examination," *College Board Review*, No. 25 (Winter, 1955), pp. 7-8.

⁶ The best known of these scales was the "Hillegas Composition Scale," developed on the basis of the theory which underlay Thorndike's Handwriting Scale. For a description of this scale, see Milo B. Hillegas, "Scale for the Measurement of Quality in English Composition by Young People," *Teachers College Record*, XIII (September, 1912), pp. 331-84.

An example of this procedure is afforded by the General Composition Test (GCT) sponsored by the College Entrance Examination Board, first as an experiment, and during the last two years provisionally as an operational test.⁷ The assumptions underlying the experimentation with the GCT were (1) that essay problems can be so structured as to call forth a maximal creative effort from a large range of student writers, and (2) that competent teachers of English can judge student essays with satisfactory consistency if we are willing to define "satisfactory consistency" in terms of what we may ever expect from human judgments, and if we are willing to provide the readers with adequate training at the time of reading. During the experimental phase of the GCT, these assumptions seemed to be borne out. Clearly, teachers of English have a variety of ideas about what comprises satisfactory writing. Nonetheless, when they were brought together in a relatively small group of twenty readers, and allowed to discuss their divergent standards, reasonable consensus was achieved. As a matter of fact, the agreement between two independent readers of the same essay during the experimental phase of the GCT was about 80 percent. During the two years that the test has been operational in the College Board series—and consequently has been read more or less on a mass basis (with from fifty to fifty-five readers)—the agreement has been about 76 per cent. However, we have every reason to believe that, as we improve our methods of training readers, agreement again can be raised to 80 per cent and even higher.

Since the usefulness of any free-response test must necessarily be judged in terms of the accuracy with which it is scored, it seems relevant here to discuss briefly the assumptions that underlay the training of GCT readers. These were two-fold: first, we assumed that a free, critical response on the part of an experienced teacher has validity, and, second, we assumed that writing is not a single act, but rather a complex process. As a result of the first assumption, the training of readers was carried on in terms of their own definition of qualities of writing, and of levels of excellence. No complicated and exacting rubric was ever imposed upon the readers. GCT training sessions have

always been discussion sessions: the readers have never been told what to look for; yet in the course of five years these discussions, though carried on by a changing group of teachers, have resulted in an amazingly consistent set of definitions. Always the attempt has been to bring the group of readers to the point of agreement without the prescription of previously concocted standards—and this despite the fact that some individuals would rather follow directions than engage in the rigorous and really demanding task of entering into a group process and expending the creative effort necessary to experience the "sense of the meeting." This principle is important because it reverses the method by which agreement of judges has been sought during the last two or three decades: that is, to have readers memorize a comprehensive rubric and to judge the essays objectively on this basis. Such a method would undoubtedly result in a higher reader reliability than we have been able to achieve with the GCT, but it would at the same time rob the final judgments of anything more than a mechanical meaning. It is the richness of the teacher-reader as a critic of student performance that we seek; to over-mechanize the reader's task is to deprive it of significance for the sake of statistics.

As a result of the second assumption, we asked the readers to evaluate each essay, not in terms of a single, overall judgment, but in terms of the five qualities: *Mechanics*, *Style*, *Organization*, *Reasoning*, and *Content*. While much deliberation went into the selection of just these five qualities, we have never assumed that they describe perfectly or completely the process of writing. They have been used operationally and have proved helpful, since their use has enabled readers to describe their reactions to an essay more completely than they could if they were required to assign only a single grade. Further, such a scheme of grading provides the student or the school with a diagnostic score. In addition, the use of the five-

⁷ For a description of the experimentation with the GCT, see Earle G. Eley, "The Experiment in General Composition," *The College Board Review*, No. 15 (November, 1951), pp. 217-221, and Earle G. Eley, "The Test Satisfies an Educational Need," *College Board Review*, No. 25 (Winter, 1955), pp. 9-13.

quality scale allows for a more precise estimate of reader agreement, since when two readers disagree violently with respect to, say, mechanics, this conflict might seem to be complete were they merely asked to assign a single grade, but comprises only a 20 per cent disagreement, when they are assigning five grades. It should be noted here that, in the case of the GCT reading, disagreements between readers are always resolved by a third, independent reading of the essay.

While there is no doubt that much remains to be done in discovering how to set a free-response language test and in developing ways of training judges to score such a test, the results of five years of work with the GCT would seem to indicate that such a method of testing *is* feasible in cases where objectively scored tests are invalid. However, in order to tolerate such methods of testing we must be willing to admit that human judgments are more subject to error than are machines. We must accept the error which machines can avoid in order to gain the critical insight which machines cannot give us. Objections to human judgments of essays have always been made in absolute terms: judges either agree or disagree. The fact is that two judges almost never come to absolute agreement—they merely come close enough together to be said to be in agreement. Their judgments fall within some defined range which is conventionally considered to be agreement. The fault in this procedure is to consider as absolute disagreement judgments which miss the defined range by a hair's breadth. If they are a hair's breadth outside of the limit of tolerance, it is better than if they are the width of a hand apart. Judgments which *almost* coincide tell us more than judgments which are clearly contradictory. In the scoring of the GCT, and in the reporting of the results, we have attempted to make some estimate of the tolerable limits of disagreement between human judges, and to recognize the validity of two judgments when those judgments are sufficiently close together to indicate that both readers had almost the same notion of achievement in mind.⁸

The last two charges made against the GCT—and hence against the essay test or any free response language test—seem to me to be

most trivial, and I have reserved them for a hasty refutation. The charge that an essay test lacks test reliability is an unanswerable one. To a certain extent, it certainly does, since, clearly, a given individual may feel more like writing on one day than on another, may respond more creatively to one topic than to another, or may just happily "get an idea" on a certain occasion. Yet his habits of language usage remain a constant, and too much can be made of the test unreliability of the essay. Objective tests, when they have been carefully constructed, usually possess a high degree of test reliability, since they require a mechanical operation, the exercise of which is less likely than the exercise of creative effort to vary from day to day. If we take the measure of test reliability too seriously, such tests have all the advantage. However, if one wishes to measure a creative operation, a mechanical test is unlikely to prove the best means, however, reliable it may be. One is reminded of the aged joke about the man who looked for his lost watch under the street-light, not because he had lost it under the street-light, but because there was more light there. If we wish to measure complex human behaviors, we must certainly be willing to put up with the insecurity imposed upon us by the variability of human personality.

As to the new and bizarre charge that the essay test is not a valid test of writing ability, one need say little. It is true that any single free language attempt does not completely reveal the author, for reasons already discussed, namely, the mood of the writer or speaker, the intensity of the stimulus, or the chance of a happy association. This, again, is a vagary of the human personality which we must accept: our problem is to find ways of setting the test situation so as to minimize it: the solution does not lie in never testing his creative powers at all. A test which does not even require the candidate to write is scarcely likely to prove a more valid test of writing than one which does. Here, we should recall the aims of instruction. We are not attempting to measure the ability to use "everybody's language."

⁸ For a more technical description of the statistical problem which this attempt has posed, see "A Question of Reliability," *College Board Review*, No. 25 (Winter, 1955), p. 12.

but rather to measure the ability to couch an individual experience in language that communicates the particularity of that experience. The essay test, or any kind of free language examination, measures better than an objectively scored test the important aims of language instruction, since we necessarily place as our primary aim in language teaching the development in the student of an originality and flexibility in his way of seeing his inner and outer universe. We do *not* confine our aims to the mere development of mechanical skills.

The teacher who has been bombarded by arguments made by administrators, admissions officers, and educational specialists, and who is, himself, not sufficiently conversant with the confusing statistics used to support these arguments may frequently give up the fight,

and merely think to himself that he will teach what he considers important, and let the tests go where they will. To give up the fight is a mistake. Despite himself, the teacher must be concerned with the kinds of tests by which his work and the achievement of his students will be evaluated. Tests will influence teaching whether we like it or not, and when the test leads the teaching, the three questions that should be the basis of evaluation have been put in reverse order. The results of this reversal could well be disastrous in our society, unless we feel that professional test-makers are better guides to the future than are the teachers of America.

EARLE G. ELEY

Examiner in English and Humanities
University of Chicago

* * *

There is another important sense in which language is a socializer beyond its literal use as a means of communication. This is in the establishment of rapport between the members of a physical group, such as a house party. It is not what is said that matters so much as that something is said. Particularly where cultural understandings of an intimate sort are somewhat lacking among the members of a physical group it is felt to be important that the lack be made good by a constant supply of small talk. This caressing or reassuring quality of speech in general, even where no one has anything of moment to communicate, reminds us how much more language is than a mere technique of communication. Nothing better shows how completely the life of man as an animal made over by culture is dominated by the verbal substitutes for the physical world.

—EDWARD SAPIR

* * *

The main value to education of the study of a foreign language lies in its unique contribution to an understanding of the principles of the communication of thought. A basic aim of all serious education is a comprehension of the distinction between a concept and the words, or symbols, used to describe that concept. The person with only one language is at a hopeless disadvantage in such a task. The color yellow can never be appreciated by itself, but only as one of a series, by comparison with red and blue. Many of the critics of language study have themselves studied foreign languages and appear to be unaware that this study has contributed much toward their ability to think. Having color vision themselves they recommend color blindness for others.

—MARSHALL J. WALKER

* * *

“Cathay and the Way Thither”: Oriental Literature in the World Literature Program

ORIENTALISTS inspecting so-called “World” literature courses in American universities have occasionally expressed shocked surprise at the almost total exclusion of Oriental literature from these courses, even after a decade of admonitions from press, pulpit and politician to “think globally.” However, it is probably not the reaction of orientalists—for orientalists and modern language scholars seldom get together—but the morning headlines that have encouraged a few editors to include Oriental material in World literature anthologies and have intimidated a few others into qualifying “World” with the adjective “Western.” Little progress has been made. Indeed, the Oriental material in one popular survey anthology was dropped from the second edition because the publisher found that the material was not being used. It is easy to accuse the modern language teacher of over-specialization, intellectual apathy, and the ivory-tower syndrome. The truth is that at the present time Oriental literature presents difficulties for the survey course that makes the value of the material out of proportion to the work necessary to teach it effectively, were it not for a desperate need for some insight into the Oriental mind in the experience of all Westerners. Let us take a specific case. The addition of the *Odyssey* to a general literature course involves adding a work which the teacher (who is probably not trained in Greek or in Comparative Literature) has certainly read before and has probably studied intensively before. The teacher knows certain aspects of the Greek tradition whether his field is Renaissance English drama, Romantic poetry, or even modern American fiction. In preparing the material, if the teacher is so uncritical as to select his reference books at random from the card catalogue, he cannot fail to find competent studies of the *Odyssey* if he confines himself to books of the last two decades. If, however, a globally-minded course chairman decides to include some T’ang poems

or a Japanese novel, the situation is vastly different. Leaving aside the difficulties of teaching anything in translation, the problems encountered here are special and considerable. Sometimes even the gifted Arthur Waley nods, and even given a close yet poetic translation of a Chinese poem, the teacher will have difficulties controlling his interpretation. He will need to know that in certain poems “pleasure garden” simply means the palace grounds and that a “scented grove” is a brothel. With a thorough command of the Oriental studies of the past three decades one can find out a great deal about Chinese poetry in general, but there has been little *explication de texte*. Furthermore, few teachers of World literature are prepared to take a year off to prepare a single unit in a course, whose varied character offers difficulties.

No history of Chinese literature now available in any language, including Chinese, is adequate both historically and critically. The one likely to be in almost every American library, by Giles, is so poorly written and so inadequate that any alert scholar soon senses its unreliability. Other more sober works in German are not much better. Two recent verbose volumes by the French scholar Margouliès are the best we have. The teacher attacking Chinese fiction for the first time is not likely to discover very easily Eberhard’s work (published in Ascona) or Pouček’s articles in *Acta Orientalni* (published in Prague). Admittedly, Chinese literature is the worst to handle; Arabic and Persian have been adequately covered by the literary historian, though the problem of explication remains. Sanskrit and the literatures of the ancient Near East have been studied longest and are the easiest to prepare, bibliographically speaking. Here, however, the abundance of both translations and commentaries provides a problem of selection. Several older translations of the *Bhagavadgita* are much superior for student use to a number of recent ones. No critical bibliographies exist

for most of the field of Oriental literature; no comprehensive enumerative bibliography has been published since the last issue of the *Orientalische Bibliographie* in 1922. Even if a current one existed it would be of use only to the most diligent of students of World literature: the lack of annotation sends the investigator to reviews, the reviews are usually highly technical and not tailored to the needs of the non-orientalist, and the results are apt to be discouraging. Occasionally the teacher may stumble on what he needs. The ACLS-sponsored *Selected List of Books and Articles on Japan* lists literary histories and translations with brief but critical comment. James R. Hightower's *Topics in Chinese Literature* contains much valuable information.

That Oriental literature ought to find a place in the World literature program, in the general course, on the undergraduate level, and at universities which cannot draw on an Oriental studies department for lecturers I regard as so self-evident as not to need debate. Probably nowhere better than in literature courses can an acquaintance with the Orient be made by the average undergraduate. But if the teacher is not going to be required to spend an inordinate amount of time on preparation and if the superficial "appreciation" of Oriental literature which characterized the Comparative Literature movement of the 19th century is not going to be repeated, the teacher will need some assistance in preparing his material. When we discover that Oriental literature is trying not only to invade the conventional World literature course but has now found a place in a cultural course for Bell Telephone executives in Philadelphia, it is apparent that the hour is late.

A practical solution to this problem and one that will not have to wait for the completion of many valuable scholarly projects now in progress is the preparation of teaching guides to a select number—it need not be more than a dozen—of Oriental works which are available in adequate translations. These guides would list and evaluate in some detail material on the historical, philosophical and religious background of the work and on the literary interpretation of it and would provide, if necessary, exegesis, always with the needs of the teacher in mind. Works which would provide a considerable variety of material are: *Gilgamesh*, the

Panchatantra, the *Arabian Nights*, the *Bhagavadgita*, the Noh plays in Waley's edition, Waley's volume of Chinese poetry, the *Tale of Genji*, Kalidasa's *Sakuntala*, the Wisdom of the East Series *Hafiz of Shiraz*, the *Jataka*, *All Men Are Brothers*, and *Monkey*. Absent from this list is the work of Confucius, readily available but difficult to interpret and full of problems more philosophical than literary.

The proportion of historical to critical and exegetical material in the guide will necessarily vary with the nature of the work. The approach of the teacher to a work like *Gilgamesh* begins with a consideration of it as an example of the epic. A study like Bowra's *Heroic Poetry* will provide the detail to reveal similarities between *Gilgamesh* and other epics, most of them Western. What is needed then are works which place the Oriental epic in its *Sitz im Leben* and evaluate it critically, revealing especially the differences between the Oriental and the classical-Western idea of the form. There are numerous books and articles which will do the former but there is the difficulty of selecting them; there are some which will do the latter. A line by line explication of the poem is not needed, but certain difficult passages need to be glossed and familiar parallels need to be drawn with better known material, such as the flood episode and its relation to the Old Testament story. A considerable literature is available on the flood story and an annotated bibliographical guide would be a great time saver in coming to grips with it. The teacher will not be able to assume, once he finds that he can use *Gilgamesh* in the classroom, that he can venture easily into other areas of Babylonian-Assyrian literature. Many less studied, more difficult texts can be controlled only by the expert. In a recent issue of the *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* Thorkild Jacobsen and Samuel N. Kramer print without apology, in the same article, two different translations and interpretations of the same cuneiform text, the condition of which would make the investigator of modern manuscripts shudder. These areas of light and shadow in the understanding of Oriental works account for limiting this material in World literature courses to a select group of well-studied works.

A different kind of problem arises with a brief lyric poem. It will immediately occur to the teacher that close reading is the approach to the

Chinese lyric as well as to the Western one. A certain amount of historical and perhaps philosophical data may be necessary to provide background, but less than with *Gilgamesh*. The problem will be to find the aesthetic equivalent of the original poem. To guide his students through Waley's *Translations from the Chinese* the teacher will have to demonstrate, by a thorough examination of a few poems, the mechanism of Chinese poetry. The teaching guide ideally will consist of (1) the ideographs with transliteration and word by word translation, (2) a literal translation in prose, sufficiently expanded to provide a modern equivalent in meaning, (3) a modern poetic rendering (it would be well to select lyrics on which Waley has done a superior job), and (4) a commentary. This follows in substance the suggestions made by Professor James R. Hightower in a review of some recent translations from the Chinese, and has been applied in teaching Chinese poetry in translation by Professors Harold Shadick of Cornell and Chou Kou-P'ing of the University of Wisconsin. If it be argued that the poem will be smothered in such a mass of apparatus, the reader need only consider the apparatus, actual and assumed in the minds of the students, necessary to explicate such English poems as Donne's "The Ecstasy" or Southwell's "Burning Babe."

The apparatus should permit the teacher to examine parts of the work closely and also to make generalizations about it and comparisons of it and Western works. For the *Arabian Nights* the guide must lead the teacher to the best of the few studies on the origin of the collection and to the best of the many studies on the migrations of World story and on the analogues of the stories found in the *Nights*; it should also provide him with such material as is available on the technique of story telling as it is practiced today in Arab countries. For the *Panchatantra*, some knowledge of the use of the fable in education in ancient India is necessary; for the *Bhagavadgita*, some knowledge of Hindu philosophy. It may occur to the teacher as it did to Mr. Anthony West in a recent broadcast of "Invitation to Learning" that there are resemblances between the *Tale of Genji* and *À la recherche du temps perdu*, but if he is cautious he will not press such a comparison until he is familiar with the social and intellectual milieu

of the *Genji*. (He will find, incidentally, that Mr. Donald Keene, in a recently published, long needed critical introduction to Japanese literature, makes this very comparison.)

The attention paid to Oriental material in recent reference works like Shipley's *Encyclopedia of Literature* and Cassell's *Encyclopaedia of Literature* has created a favorable climate for the teaching of Oriental material but has not provided the teacher with the means to do it. A tremendous mass of scholarship on Oriental literature is listed in the recent Baldensperger-Friederich *Bibliography of Comparative Literature* and its supplement, the *Yearbook of Comparative Literature*. The *Guide to Comparative Literature*, sponsored by the National Council of Teachers of English and edited by Charlton G. Laird, is ready for the press; it will provide bibliographical data for the Oriental literatures in general. The progress of the historiography of Arab literature has been assessed in a valuable article by Gustave E. von Grunebaum;¹ a similar article for each of the major Oriental literatures would be of the greatest use. None of these aids, however, focuses sharply enough on the individual literary work, as the teacher must in the classroom. Valuable articles on the work may be found in journals from Hanoi to Stockholm. To make this information accessible and to evaluate it for the teacher is the first step in giving Oriental literature its proper place in the college program. At the present time a Conference on Oriental-Western literary relations in the Modern Language Association is discussing the problem of teaching aids. The preliminary editions of these aids need not be large; some secretarial time stolen from an academic department and fifty dollars would put the project in business. What is needed is efficient direction and some time—it need not be an inordinate amount of it—given to it by those orientalists and modern language scholars interested in the teaching of Oriental literature, a group of scholars whose time is already heavily mortgaged, to be sure. But the aids are badly needed, and now.

G. L. ANDERSON

New York University

¹ "Islamic Literature: Arabic," *Near Eastern Culture and Society: A Symposium on the Meeting of East and West*, edited by T. Cuyler Young (Princeton, 1951), pp. 48-65.

A Brief Classification of the Limits of Translatability

TRADUTTORE *traditore* is a maxim that most language teachers would probably be willing to defend. Whenever we argue for the place of foreign language study in the curriculum we are apt to insist that "something" gets lost in translation, that no matter how good the translation, there is always an intranslatable residue. But just what is this mystical something that gets lost? How can the problem of "intranslatability" be stated in more precise terms? We are faced here with a question important to the linguist as well as the literature scholar. In this article, we shall try to define the major categories of intranslatability.

In approaching the problem we shall take the linguistic concepts established by F. de Saussure in his *Cours de Linguistique générale*¹ as a starting point. Language (*la langue*) is the system of linguistic signs which the members of a speech community utilize for the purpose of communication. This system of *la langue* must be differentiated from the actual instances of Speech, the Speech events by which the speakers avail themselves of the system, and which make up *la parole*. The linguistic signs are composed of two inextricably connected parts: the sounds, the signifiers (*signifiant*) and the signified concepts (*signifié*). The relation between signifier and signified is arbitrary in the sense that, normally at least, there is no inherent reason why a specific concept or object should be referred to by a specific sound rather than any others.

The signified can be considered from the point of view of either *la langue* or *la parole*. In actual speech, in *la parole*, the linguistic sign expresses a specific idea or concept. Thus only in actual speech can the linguistic sign have specific meaning (*signification*). Within the system the sign has many potential meanings, it is polysemous as some linguists put it,² or in the terminology of F. de Saussure it possesses not Meaning but Value (*Valeur*). This Value of the

linguistic sign is determined within the system and by the system of *la langue*. It is determined by the synonyms and near synonyms for which the sign may be exchanged and which within the system limit its potential functions. It is extremely unlikely and from the theoretical point of view impossible—Values are determined by relationships within each system—that two signs of two different linguistic systems should ever have the same Value: in the words of de Saussure, "le français mouton peut avoir la même signification que l'anglais *sheep*, mais non la même valeur."³ The signs of different systems can be identical only in the sense that they can be put to the same specific uses. Their potential uses will never be the same.

The sentence *je bois du café* is a translation of *I am drinking coffee*, because the French sentence as well as the English sentence refer to the same idea, to the same act. But *I* is not a translation of *je* (very often the translation of *I* will be *moi*), *bois* is not a translation of *drink*, etc. Thus the question "how does one say I in French" is not an answerable or meaningful question, and should, as a result, be avoided in the language classroom.

Using S as a symbol for signifier, V as a symbol for Value and M as a symbol for Meaning, we may thus describe the linguistic sign in *La langue* as S/V and the linguistic sign in *la parole* as S/M. A perfect translation from language 1 to language 2 takes place when $M_1 = M_2$ because they both represent the same reference (R). The law of intranslatability that we have been discussing may be stated as $V_1 \neq V_2$: Isolated signs without specific reference are con-

¹ F. de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale* (publié par Charles Bally et Albert Sechehaye), 3rd ed., Paris, 1949. See also R. L. Politzer "On a Linguistic Classification of Teaching Methods," *MLJ*, XXXVII (1953), 331.

² William L. Graff, *Language and Languages*, New York, 1932, p. 101.

³ F. de Saussure, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

sidered from the point of view of the system and are therefore not capable of translation into another language.

From the point of view of translation within the context the inequality of values may also become important. For in many instances words are not used with a clear cut single meaning, but their entire value plays a role in their actual use. Obvious examples for this importance of values, within actual speech are, for instance, the pun or intentional ambiguity. Both offer, for this reason, considerable difficulty to the translator and are often completely intranslatable.⁴ Inequalities of value may also have another result. Expressions of two different languages may mean the same, but the associations they suggest, the images they invoke are apt to be different.⁵ Texts in which ambiguity, suggestiveness are important are thus always more difficult or often impossible to translate. Texts in which all sentences have single, clear cut meaning offer fewer difficulties. Literature offers usually greater problems to the translator than scientific prose.

The next category of "intranslatabilities" to be mentioned is also important primarily from the point of view of literature. The relation between the signifier and the signified is as we have stated above an arbitrary one. This axiomatic assumption of de Saussure has been questioned and has been subject to prolonged discussion mainly from the point of view that insists that within the system the relation between signifier and signified is a necessary rather than an arbitrary one: for without the signifier the signified concept could not exist and *vice versa*. This is no doubt true but what de Saussure wanted to insist upon was merely that—perhaps with the possible exception of onomatopoeitic words—configuration of sounds themselves do not convey any meaning; they acquire meaning by functioning in a linguistic system. They are so to speak, the proxy of the ideas or concepts for which they stand. Yet at the same time, there are modes of expression in which the signifiers themselves can assume autonomous importance of their own: *I am drinking coffee* means *Je bois du café*, true enough; it is also true and obvious that the French sentence sounds differently, uses different sound combinations,

different rhythms, etc. In normal every day discourse these differences are of no importance; but what about poetry, what about literature generally speaking? There the sounds, the rhythms, the words used acquire an autonomous value of their own. As especially the members of the formalist school of literary criticism have insisted, the very "literariness" of literature, the feature which distinguished it from everyday speech lies precisely in the fact that in literature the author manipulates the linguistic system according to rules which are different from those which apply in ordinary speech, and which assign independent intrinsic importance to the signifier. Thus one formalist critic defined poetic language as "one of the linguistic systems where the communicative function is relegated to the background and where verbal structures acquire autonomous value." Or as Roman Jakobson puts it: "The distinctive feature of poetry lies in the fact that a word is perceived as a word and not merely as the proxy for the denoted object or an outburst of emotion, that words and their arrangements, their meaning, their outward and inward form acquire weight and value of their own."⁶

This formalistic approach to literary criticism provides us thus with a clear cut statement of another important approach to the problem of intranslatability. For if the role of the signifier is not arbitrary, if the signifier has autonomous importance of its own, it is obvious that the

⁴ The simplest example for an intranslatability due to inequality of value is probably the pun: For instance the Encyclopaedia Britannica (article Humour) quotes as example for the pun: "Ben Battle was a soldier bold and used to war's alarms, a cannon ball took off his legs, so he laid down his arms." The pun consists in the double reference to "arms" in English. Obviously it could not be reproduced in let us say French or Spanish. But the possibility of double reference is basically also the principle involved in any ambiguity—and according to some literary critics (e.g. William Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity*, New York, 1931) ambiguity is the very essence of poetic expression.

⁵ A good example for this type difference in suggestion or association is quoted in a recent issue of PMLA: English "military" becomes in Russian "war-like," a word which suggests much more directly the immediate connection with war.

⁶ The two statements—the first by B. Tomashevsky, the second by R. Jakobson, are quoted from V. Erlich "The Russian Formalist Movement," *Partisan Review*, 1953, pp. 282–296.

signifiers of one language even though they may express the same meaning, cannot take the place of the signifiers of another language and achieve the same literary effect. The very "literariness" of literature, to use the formalist term, is not translatable. To use again the symbols employed above we may thus state the second important law of intranslatability as $S_1 \neq S_2$ or as $S_1/M_1 \neq S_2/M_2$ indicating that the physical nature of the signifier of one language is not duplicated by the signifier of the other language, and that the relation of signifier to signified (in literature no longer arbitrary but of autonomous importance) is not capable of translation into another language.

Above we have stated that the identity of meaning which permits us to consider the statement made in one language as the translation of a statement made in another language is ultimately due to an identity of reference. This identity of reference is, of course, the prerequisite of communication even within the same language: If I make the statement that *I believe in democracy*, real communication will take place only if my audience and I refer to the same kind of democracy. But if the audience belongs to a different culture, then we may have to consider the possibility that it may either not know what democracy is or it may know it in a very different form. If those with whom I am trying to communicate do not know English, my statement will then be in a sense intranslatable: either there will be no word for democracy in their language, this institution or form of government being unknown in their culture, or there may be a word for democracy but referring to a different kind: the statement translated into their language will not have the same referent as it had in English. In either case the meaning of the English sentence will not be fully rendered in the foreign language. Our third principle of intranslatability may then be stated as $R=O$ (indicating the absence of the referent in the other culture) or as $R_1 \neq R_2$ (indicating the referent appears typically under a different form). The limitations on translation imposed by differences in cultural environment are very often quite subtle.⁷ They are often determined by the individual's knowledge of the foreign culture, and unlike the rules which we have stated before, are not general rules which

apply objectively regardless of the person involved in the translation (or communication) process. Nevertheless they are extremely important from the pedagogical point of view: They underline the intimate and inevitable tie between culture and language study. They underline the necessity of studying the culture of a country along with its language. For the student who learns to manipulate a linguistic structure without knowledge of the culture in which this linguistic structure operates, learns ultimately to manipulate symbols without meaning or symbols to which he attaches the wrong meanings. Thus it is true that the study of the foreign language is a valuable key to the study of the foreign culture; for those lexical items which for lack of a comparable referent in the other culture are intranslatable are a good index to important cultural differences: but more than that, the study of culture is an integral and necessary part of the study of language.

So far we have retained our equation of translatability $M_1 = M_2$ under the condition that the statements made in the two languages have the same referent. The above discussed limitation on translatability merely stated that as a result of objective culture differences this identity of reference may at times not exist. But there are linguistic theories which would go farther than that, and which would assert that any identity of reference existing between statements made in different languages is actually impossible: These are the theories which conceive of language not merely as a mechanism of symbols used to refer to reality outside of language, but which insist that reality as we see it, in other words the referents themselves, are shaped by the language which we are speaking. The way reality appears to us is then ultimately determined by the linguistic system which we are using. This view is found particularly among those who investigate languages radically different from the Indoeuropean. One of the first definitive statements of the theory came from Wilhelm V. Humboldt who asserted in his well-known *Einleitung zum Kawiwerk* that every language presents a particular view of the

⁷ For a long series of examples of intranslatabilities caused by differing cultural environments see Eugene A. Mida, *Bible Translating*, New York, 1947, pp. 149 ff.

world, that just as the sound of language interposes itself between the speaker and objective reality, so language as such interposes a world of its own between reality and the speaker and it is the world of language rather than the world of reality in which the individual lives.⁸ Extreme statements of the same view come from anthropological linguists, especially the late B. L. Whorf who came to the conclusion that "all observers are not led by the same physical evidence to the same picture of the universe unless their linguistic backgrounds are similar."⁹ An essentially identical view is also held by some grammarians like Damourette and Pichon when they assert that "la pensée d'un locuteur quelconque est donc constamment coulée sur la moule de la grammaire de la langue qui lui sert à penser."¹⁰ The implication of all these views is obvious: If linguistic symbols are not used to refer to reality, but are the shapers of concepts and of reality, then the bridge that provides for the possibility of translation from one language into another is really removed; the supposed translation becomes really a different way of looking at a world which becomes practically unknowable in an objective sense.¹¹

This article does not purport to give an extensive treatment of the subject of intranslatability, but rather an outline of the basic principles according to which the subject could be approached by the foreign language teacher. As long as we think of a foreign language merely as a new set of symbols which can be applied without difficulty to express the facts and concepts with which the student is already familiar, foreign language study must appear trivial to the American student and perhaps even more to the pragmatic or pragmatically trained American educator: to learn new symbols for already familiar facts cannot be a very important educational aim. We language teachers must make it clear that the study of language is more than the juggling of new symbols, that it introduces the student to new facts or at least to a completely new way of looking at already familiar facts.

Linguistic Science, especially American Linguistic Science had tried to elevate the study of language to the status and the prestige of the other factual sciences by insisting that linguistic signs can be treated not only as symbols stand-

ing for facts, but also as facts themselves subject to scientific investigation. But the study of symbols as facts rather than symbols standing for facts provides justification and a basis for prestige for the linguistic specialist; it does not make the study of language significant for the student who ultimately studies the language for the sake of expressing and understanding meanings. To him we must make it clear that the study of language does not mean new symbols for old familiar facts, but new symbols for new facts, for an entirely new world.

Insistence on intranslatabilities will go far in achieving this emphasis in language instruction: We are so used to the question *How do you say this in English?* Let us not forget about the much more important one, namely *Why can't this be said in English?*

ROBERT L. POLITZER

University of Michigan

⁸ See W. v. Humboldt, *Einleitung zum Kawiwerk = Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts, in Gesammelte Schriften*, VII, Berlin, 1907, especially p. 60.

⁹ B. L. Whorf, "Science and Linguistics," *Technology Review*, LII (1940), 247-248.

¹⁰ Jacques Damourette and Edouard Pichon, *Des Mots à la Pensée (Essai de grammaire de la langue française)*, 1911-1927, Vol. I, p. 15. For other recent discussion and research on the theory of language being an influential part in the thinking and cognition process see H. Basilius, "Neo-Humboldtian Ethnolinguistics," *Word*, VIII (1952), 95-105, S. Ohmann, "Theories of the 'Linguistic Field,'" *Word* IX (1953), 123-135.

¹¹ This last category we have mentioned may seem to rely on a philosophical proposition which is not capable of scientific proof; yet experiments are being carried out with the view of proving the "ethnolinguistic" hypothesis. See, for instance, Eric P. Lenneberg, "Cognition and Ethnolinguistics," *Language*, XIX (1953) 463-472, where the author tries to prove that the linguistic system influences our perception of colors (and thus our concepts of them). The purely philosophic assumption on which the very possibility of translation rests, is the dualistic philosophy of language of de Saussure which is the starting point of this article: The possibility of translation exists only if we recognize that the signified and meaning have an identity apart from the signifier and can thus be expressed again in another language. According to a purely idealistic philosophy of language, which asserts that language is only "idea" or "expression" translation is by definition an impossibility (cf. B. Croce, *Estetica, come scienza dell'espressione e linguistica generale*, Bari, 1912, 4th ed., p. 86, on "la possibilità relativa delle traduzioni").

*The Need for Language Study in America Today**

OBSERVERS of America have often remarked on the need for perpetual motion which seems to beset American education. Some have praised it as an aspect of the soul-searching and even of the breast-beating which should characterize a religious and moral country and especially the members of the most self-critical of all professions. Others have derided it as a symptom of feverish instability and of the immature pursuit of gadgets and new recipes. Ironical amateur psychoanalysts have even diagnosed it as a compensation mechanism in American teachers, who, unable, for reasons of age or money, to indulge in winter sports or fearful of the risks entailed by baseball or football, take their revenge on the curriculum and on the schedules of their institutions, and dauntlessly kick them about in committee meetings.

The truth is that no country prizes education more dearly than does America. No country cherishes its youth more fondly, none has been more anxious to do right by it and to live up to its faith in progress through making education progressive. Some of the aims pursued may have been naively defined, but they were noble aims: to bring knowledge within the reach of all and make education democratic, at the risk of levelling down and of untold waste; to bring knowledge to bear upon life and to stress the practical and immediate benefits which may accrue from "a little learning"; thus to change the lot of the common man and increase the sum of happiness in the Western hemisphere.

Yet such worthy ideals have not been attained, if and when they have been, without corresponding losses. The loss to the traditional humanities has been grievous, and grievously mourned. The liberal and even the practical value of the subjects which replaced ancient languages has indeed been doubtful. The fourth and fifth decades of the present century then witnessed a concerted onslaught on the modern humanities: living languages and literatures. Attackers were undaunted by the contempla-

tion of the shrunken world around them and by the obvious myriad links which new media of communication and the foreign entanglements thrust upon America had woven all around them. They were and are men of earnest zeal who claim that they have aligned many disinterested arguments against the study of language and that a new deal favoring other subjects is overdue.

We are convinced that they are misguided and that their sincere but hasty and perhaps unenlightened crusaders' campaign for new subjects replacing modern languages has not served American education, American democracy and America's urgent need to understand the rest of the world better and to be better understood by it. We wish to state our reasons candidly in writing, at the request of numerous persons who have heard us do so orally.¹

The first duty of a teacher is to see his subject as part of a larger whole and never to lose sight of the aims of education in general, while contributing to a small province of it to the best of his ability. The aims of education as we see them may be briefly defined thus: 1) To know, assimilate and hand down in turn to our successors the best and the living in the legacy of the past. 2) To understand the present or, as Matthew Arnold once put it, defining the ideal of the French pupil in schools which he had just visited, "to understand himself and the world". 3) To prepare the future imaginatively, and with flexibility blended with essential steadiness of purpose. 4) To prepare for democratic life and for cooperation in an ever-shrinking world, it being understood that true democracy is not averse to wise and selective leadership.

* Reprinted with the kind permission of the French Cultural Services in the United States.

¹ At the Yale Barnard conference on the teaching of French, in New Haven, on April 19, 1952, at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association in Boston on December 28, 1952, and elsewhere. A booklet we wrote on the same subject, published in 1950 by the Cultural Division of the French Embassy, is now out of print.

Are we worthy of such a lofty program? Three trends have lately been discernible in education, which may well cause some disquietude. The first led many persons to advocate a clean break with the past: the world has changed, they said, with the industrial revolutions and the machine age; let us therefore give up the old subjects and concentrate upon the state of the world in the last few years. The second tendency rested on a false interpretation of democracy as freedom unlimited, many rights but very few duties, the discarding of grades and a taboo on the hated word "discipline." "Poor dears!" said the parents of their offspring, "they work so hard! Why should they not get a good grade?" Or else: "Why not banish genders, declensions, subjunctives and other such un-American paraphernalia, unwanted in our streamlined age?" And again: "This is a free country. Let me elect any subject I like, home economics rather than French, and in the place of English Composition, I shall choose a course on marriage problems and learn how to choose a wife." Alas! never have there been more divorces than since courses in marriage problems were established. Let us hope at least that graduates from such seminars have mastered the art of making their successive marriages more and more delightful.

A third fallacy led many people around us to say: "We live in a social age and should be prepared for our place in it. Social studies must provide the best means to such an end. It is selfish escapism to read Virgil or Goethe by the fireside, or to listen to Beethoven in solitary enjoyment. Let us learn about the "mores" of our fellow-beings, and even read gravely about their sexual behavior, thus become well-adjusted, react properly to stimuli, practice community thinking and develop into good citizens."

It would be an insult to the best in American education to waste time in refuting such ludicrous fallacies. We shall only attempt to do so insofar as they affect the study of languages and list the arguments which have been most widely and most loudly heard lately.

* * * * *

It is natural that from time to time new subjects should come into existence or into favor

and should crowd some of the time-honored and previously triumphant subjects out of a curriculum. Theology, ancient languages and rhetoric once ruled supreme. Modern foreign languages themselves were granted an honorable place in American universities rather late. Natural sciences then loomed so large in significance that they encroached on mathematics and the older disciplines. The trend of our age is toward the collective, toward the links binding men no longer, as in religion, in a vertical transcendence to some higher power, but horizontally, with other men in the same community or society.

No sane teacher of languages bears any grudge to the social sciences as such. They have accomplished much already. They are here to stay. They will perfect their instruments as they develop further, slough off some of their youthful fascination with quantitative measurements and their naive aping of the methods of the natural sciences. They will grant more room to the past and to historical processes. Let us even hope that their practitioners may discover the advantages of simple, elegant, unpedantic writing. Those who call themselves humanists and who have long enjoyed the liberating and maturing influence of the study of literature should be broad-minded enough to acknowledge what is valid in the claims of the social sciences and to cooperate intelligently with the devotees of those younger disciplines. Condescension and scorn have never been worthy of those who should be living examples of the refining and broadening influence of their chosen calling. Teachers of languages and literatures have much to learn from friendly contact with their "social" colleagues. Indeed is not language itself one of the primary social phenomena, and the mirror to much that lies deepest in the soul of a people? And if there has been crude naiveté at times in the use by social scientists of literature purely as a social document, it is none the less true that literature, subtly and indirectly interpreted, has much to reveal on a given society. It has, ever since Zola and even earlier, set itself as a goal the observation and imaginative recreation of social forces.

Let us admit that we have occasionally been complacent in trusting that our field of study would automatically retain its full appeal in a

mass civilization and an age which often misunderstands the true meaning of democracy as applied to education. Let us inform ourselves on the social factors in modern life on which our colleagues are placing a new emphasis. Let us buttress some of our assertions with facts, surveys, percentages, and use tests intelligently where they can be useful. Let us develop "area" course and even resign ourselves to calling them by such a barbaric name, if the word civilization horrifies our colleagues. Above all, let us borrow from the social scientists their fresh zeal for their subject and their enthusiastic and eager ambition. More teachers of language and literature should come out of their shell or shake off their shy reserve. They should display their knowledge of problems of education, of the needs of society, of their place and that of their students in the contemporary world, claim a share in adult education and help enlighten their community. More of them should thus, through proving alert and energetic personalities, accede to the positions of school principals, commissioners of education, State Department cultural officials, deans, presidents, advisers to the Foundations. After all, great American institutions, from Harvard to Chicago and from Johns Hopkins to Yale were not inefficiently run when their presidents were men with lofty ideals and strong personalities, whose fields of specialization had been Hebrew, Greek or Latin.

In a word, there is no such thing as a traditional subject, and social anthropologists are the first to acknowledge that a break with the past entails serious consequences for a culture. It cuts off young people from their parents and grandparents, it uproots them and makes them alien to a treasure of folklore, of mythological, biblical, classical allusions which cripples them for life. But there are teachers viewing their own fields in a timid traditionalist way, paralyzed by an excessive refinement or by a critical spirit which keeps them from propagating their faith in their subject and in the values which it embodies. The word imperialism has ugly connotations. Yet all that expands and robustly displays its growing and youthful strength is imperialistic. If believers in the value of languages allow others to push their subject to the fringe of the curriculum without fighting back energetically as well as intelligently, they will

soon find themselves expelled altogether.

* * * * *

The opposition which one is forced to establish in our time between the ancient languages and the modern foreign languages is an invidious and regrettable one. We side with those who believe that our culture and the training of many minds have grievously suffered from the almost general elimination of Greek and Latin from our courses of studies. Scientists like Descartes, Newton, Lavoisier, Claude Bernard, Henri Poincaré were no less inventive and no less precocious in the past for having been steeped in the classical languages. Statesmen and diplomats were in no way less well trained than today for having pondered over Thucydides and Sallustius. The thought of children of the last century rapturously engrossed in Virgil, as Michelet and Hugo were, or steeped in the Bible on Sunday mornings, as they were in Great Britain, may well arouse fond regrets in parents who today watch their offspring, on Sabbath day, rapt in comic strips.

Most severe of all is perhaps the loss to our democratic ideals. For not American, British, or French history, but ancient history and oratory long nurtured the faith of the great leaders of the West: Pericles' celebrated oration in the second book of Thucydides, Demosthenes' *Philippics*, Cicero's pleadings against the foes of the republic, even Horace's verse on "pro patria mori" and Livy's narratives, read at a receptive age, have molded the devotion to their country of many French, American, and British who worked, and died in some cases, for their country. From Jefferson, Rousseau, Burke, the leaders of the French Revolution, to Gladstone, Balfour and Churchill, to Jaurès, Herriot, and Blum, great statesmen had vivified their patriotism and their democratic idealism through long familiarity with those ancient writers whom the poet Yeats called somewhere "the builders of his soul."

But the role once played by the classics can be assumed by the modern languages. In some respects indeed, that role can be filled even better. For Latin literature suffered from a regrettable gap, as the literature which was long exclusively taught to children: there is no first-rate child literature in Latin, if one excepts very

minor works such as Aulus Gellius' *Attic Nights* or Apuleius' entertaining fantasy. Greece had the *Odyssey* and Herodotus; Spain had *Don Quixote*, Germany many fairy tales and charming blendings of "poetry and truth" by Goethe or Eichendorff; France has a treasure of medieval tales, Rabelais' giants, La Fontaine's animals, Alexander the great, as the author of *The Three Musketeers* has been called by an Englishman, Hugo, Daudet, Anatole France, Saint-Exupéry. If languages are to be started, as they should be, at an early age, it is essential that some reading of true quality be done then which trains children to pass from the easier and the familiar to the more abstract and the more remote.

But the practice of Greek and Latin texts used to fill another purpose in education, and their gradual disappearance has left a worse vacuum. Translating a Greek text and analyzing its verbs, its particles, its subtle syntax, construing a Latin sentence and unraveling its meaning used to teach boys to grapple with difficulty. They were then protected from the naive illusion which deceives persons who have never learned a second language: the illusion that they naturally understand all that is written in their own tongue. Many literate persons among us and even some who are called cultured have lost the habit and the desire to make any effort when confronted with a difficult text—be it the report of a company official, the articles of some international agreement or of a contract. Reading anything but a synopsis prepared by their secretary, headlines of newspapers, or comics, seems to make their heads dizzy.

Yet reading is, and should be, an active pursuit. Joyce, Kafka, T. S. Eliot, Faulkner, Proust, require some cooperation on our part. Such cooperation will be granted willingly by him who read Thucydides or Tacitus, Pascal or Cervantes while in college. His teeth were hardened by some of the tough nuts that he had to crack, and the ensuing reward justified the effort. A person who has never attempted to decipher any language but his own naively assumes that he knows his own, and that Shakespeare, Meredith, Melville are his by birthright. He does not bring an active and imaginative attitude to his reading. How can he successfully tackle the perusal of his daily paper? With their

cryptic headlines, their prodigality of news, often contradictory and cut up at intervals of ten or twenty pages, their distracting pictures of seductive feminine clothing and unclothing, American newspapers certainly demand from us that we exercise an acute critical spirit if we are to read between their lines and to decipher the purport of their headlines. Their readers are indeed asked to make some order out of calculated chaos. Mallarmé or Rilke are hardly less strenuous and rather more rewarding.

An eminent American scholar, Henry Grattan Doyle, has disposed once and for all of the fallacy that all good things written abroad come out in translations and make the learning of foreign languages an unnecessary bother.² Alas! there is no "once and for all" in these matters and lies obstinately repeated need obstinately repeated disproving.

It is not true that all that is good is translated. In poetry, it is manifestly untrue. In criticism, philosophy, history, it is hardly less untrue. In science, we have abstracts which are only incitements to go the full text and to follow the full demonstration if the original is in French or German (or even in one of the Romance languages for which French is helpful or in a Germanic or Scandinavian language which Germans may help decipher). The liveliest part of scientific, social and even of literary scholarship today is to be found in periodicals. Unless a scholar, a scientist, an educator, a business man is able to leaf through foreign periodicals in one or two languages at least, he loses much: indeed he loses that precisely which marks people who are likely to go to the top in their profession, through richer information and a broader perspective than their average colleague. A man who claims to be well-informed on world problems today, economic, political, diplomatic, cannot substantiate such a claim unless he reads the periodical press of at least one other non-English speaking country. The best-informed American press often appears provincial to the reader who is able to supplement it with weeklies or monthlies of another country; for those see us as only others can do and enlighten us on ourselves as well as upon others. An American

² Henry Grattan Doyle, "Will Translations Suffice?", *Language Leaflets* No. 10 (1940), George Washington University. The ten leaflets in the series are all valuable.

traveler in Europe who can only receive his news from the American newspaper published in Paris for traveling Americans can never hope to understand continental countries from the inside. Indeed he might well have stayed at home from the start, if his trip was meant at all to bring him any insight into foreign lands.

It would be easy to prove once again that translations are woefully inadequate and fail to convey the affective and the racy connotations of works in the original, the peculiar subtlety of the syntax of the foreign idiom. Nevertheless, not many educated persons will tackle the Greek or the Latin original when the translation is available; but the few whose classical training was once thorough may at least check or supplement the translation by a glance at the original and enforce their enjoyment tenfold thereby. Not many persons will master Russian, Chinese, or Dutch in order to relish the untranslatable quality of those languages. But most of our graduate schools have resorted to the reasonable solution of demanding two foreign languages, usually French and German. With some knowledge, even perfunctory, of those two idioms, an intelligent person will easily have access to a body of technical writing and of literature three times more ample than the one in his native language; he will enjoy an opportunity to read translations into either French or German from other languages, and not pass for a cultural imperialist or appear as a shy cripple in international conventions where English is often not the chief language used.

* * * * *

Through a strange inequality of treatment, foreign languages have lately been the target of those who contend that, if a subject once studied has been forgotten, that study has proved vain. They apparently repudiate with horror the famous definition of culture as that which remains in us once everything has been forgotten. Their motto might well be the pragmatic line in Faust's soliloquy which condemns as a heavy burden that which one does not utilize:

"Was man nicht nützt, ist eine schwere Last."

They do not, however, blame themselves for not using the tools which their teachers took

pains to have them acquire.

The argument that languages might well be thrown overboard because they are not used by many is a very fallacious one. By the same reasoning, do we use algebra, trigonometry, the rule of three, or even our once laboriously acquired knowledge of the multiplication tables or of the art of adding, subtracting and dividing? Do we retain a much clearer memory of English irregular verbs or of the spelling of our own language than we do of the French or Spanish grammar we once learned? Are we much more precise in our knowledge of English literature, of geology or botany, of astronomy or of physics, than we are in our enduring familiarity with the rudiments of a foreign tongue? Let us not mention, for it would be cruel, the very slight imprint which lessons of ethics, of civics and even of politeness, once dutifully absorbed, seem to have left on not a few of our mature fellow-citizens. The knowledge of what was once absorbed need not remain present in our minds, which would then be painfully cluttered up with notions not immediately relevant to the hour being lived or to the problem being faced. But it may well stay, latently or subconsciously buried within ourselves, and leave us with a capacity to reacquire, when the need arises, what was once possessed. The word possessed, however, is hardly apposite, if the language was only studied perfunctorily for two brief years or if it was started too late, in persons already afflicted with inhibitions and closed to the appeal of exotic foreignness.

"Inferiority complex" seems to have become a typically American phrase, applied by Americans to themselves. The dislike for languages in many of them is nothing but a manifestation of that inferiority complex. "We as a nation are not gifted for languages" is a phrase heard daily by foreigners entertained in this country. Those who pronounce it excuse it by the geographical argument that the contact with foreigners is not a frequent occurrence for those who live in the heartland of the North American continent. But the excuse is a ludicrously poor one in the present century and might well be left to the Russians, who do live imprisoned in a wide continent from which travelers are banned (and yet study and know languages). Natives of Illinois and of Kansas are liable to

meet foreigners any day in their own state, in their college life, in their business trips, and few are those among the more successful ones among them who will not be called upon to travel abroad several times in their lives.

But the grievous truth is that many Americans have succeeded in convincing themselves that their minds are too sluggish, their tongues too slow, their reflexes too tardy to enable them to speak other languages but their own. Such a self-disparaging complex is, however, totally unfounded. Our conviction, based upon experience, is that far more Americans succeed in speaking excellent French than do Spaniards, Englishmen and even Italians. When languages are taught orally, efficiently, and long enough, as they are in a number of private schools in America and in a much larger number of high schools than many Americans, too apologetic about their high school system, realize, boys and girls achieve a mastery which might well put many European teenagers to shame. It would take nothing but more confidence in themselves on the part of Americans, a little more effort on the part of pupils and teachers alike, and a firmer conviction that work is better and more natural for young people than laziness and even than play, actually to turn Americans into what they potentially are: next to the Slavs, the best linguists in the world.

But another prejudice must once and for all be demolished: the study of languages and of literatures is a difficult and a very masculine subject indeed, and not at all one which should be left to girls along with music and sewing, while future "males" concentrate on engineering, accounting, marketing, compiling Kinseyan statistics. Young American men are the shyest of all creatures and label "feminine" what is both alluring but mysterious and difficult, for it requires more alertness of mind and more feeling for nuances than figures and quantitative statements and logically deduced but totally unconvincing assertions. The true courage, indeed, lies in facing those half-truths and imponderable but all-important values by which the world is in fact led and those shades of significance on which most problems hinge. "Il n'y a de vérité que dans les nuances," Benjamin Constant wisely remarked. The evasion from what they have termed "feminine" has

not prevented American men from being what they are and probably should be: sensitive, emotional creatures, quick to listen to the promptings of their emotions and to respond to sympathies and dislikes, to unreasoned fears and to enthusiastic "fads."

It is moreover patently absurd to allow college boys to believe that Franklin and Jefferson and other founders of this country were effeminate because they spoke French and had read Voltaire and Rousseau; or to imply that Roosevelt and Churchill were not real "men" because they repeatedly addressed the French in the French language, made more savory by the spice of a Harrow or of a Groton accent. Indeed, the study of languages is both difficult and rewarding, like all that is worth while in this world. Forsaking it or banishing it in schools because it is not easy is profoundly un-American, and unworthy of the youth of this country, which usually does not admit to being licked without putting up a fight. The knowledge of foreign languages affords a key to the reading of Dante, Cervantes, Pascal, Goethe, Balzac, Dostoevski: are these enervating and softening influences? There is no better ordeal by fire than such reading, no saner lesson of clear-sightedness and of intellectual courage, no safer antidote to the rosy delusions and effeminate falsifications of life offered by the movies and by the pulp magazines.

Indeed, it should be left to a psychiatrist to diagnose some of the motives and fears which lurk behind the aversion of many Americans to foreign languages. It is our belief that in many cases Americans are being swayed by an unconscious immigrants' complex. They remember their parents or grandparents, who had arrived here with the will to forget their "old country," yet never succeeded in speaking, feeling, behaving like native Americans. They had striven hard to cut themselves off from the traditions and the language of the country from which their ancestors had emigrated or been expelled. Their family names may have remained Polish, German, Italian, Welsh. Yet they are now the first to find it strange that Koreans, Japanese, French and Germans should not speak with an American drawl, or that Cockneys and Scots should not possess a Brooklyn accent.

We would even submit that American reluctance to generalize the study of languages is, like nationalism, racism, xenophobia, the sign of a deep-lying morbidity. An eminent Presbyterian pastor of New York, Rev. Norman Vincent Peale, in a book which was the best-seller in the non-fiction list for 1953, computed that this nation needs nineteen and a half million sleeping pills annually to lull it to sleep, an increase of 1000% over fifteen years ago; that eleven million pounds of aspirin were sold in one single year, and that 50% of physicians' prescriptions order sedatives to even more neurotic Americans. We suggest that they would go to sleep far more harmlessly and far more securely if only they recited to themselves the subjunctive and pluperfect forms of Spanish or French, the rules of German construction, or if they merely made the effort to read or speak another language in the evening hours before retiring.

One of our national diseases is said to be inhibition under its varied forms. The fashion has lately been to cure such inhibitions through painting or sculpting. Every doctor, lawyer, dentist, manufacturer will gladly devote his Sunday to daubing and he will—alas!—periodically invite his friends to admire his inhibitions translated into an exhibition. Van Gogh, Gauguin and other martyrs of painting had not so easily succeeded in triumphing over their complexes through intense expressionism! Less harm would be done to canvasses, to walls and to the eyes of the onlookers if those worthy professional and business men had concentrated instead on mastering a foreign tongue. Indeed few joys are more radiantly expressed than the satisfaction which beams on the faces of youngsters, and even of grown-ups, when they have for the first time succeeded in delivering themselves of a correct sentence in a foreign language: "*L'arrosoir du jardinier est sur le chapeau de ma tante*" or "*je crois que nous allons assister à une nouvelle crise ministérielle.*" Drinking in order, as the phrase goes, to release one's inhibitions, might well decrease by half in America if it were replaced by the strong draught of a foreign language successfully imbibed.

* * * * *

Education is clearly a preparation for life. But such a statement is as broad and vague as the word "life" is confusing; the qualities which will be most needed in our lives as grown-ups are indeed so diverse that they remain unpredictable. The practical-minded student, who insists on preparing himself narrowly and exclusively for his chosen profession, often turns out to be the unhappiest of men. More ironical still, he seldom turns out to be the most successful in terms of material and financial standards. Literally thousands of grave statements uttered by the top men in the professions of medicine, engineering, business, law, diplomacy have warned young men against narrow and premature specialization. Some educators however will insist on ignoring the evidence of life and the experience of those who know.

The worship of the practical in education is a most fallacious myth. Reliable statistics have informed us that sixty-five per cent of all jobs in the country require a training of only three days on the job itself. Twenty-five per cent of all jobs require a training of four to six months. Ten per cent only necessitate a training of more than six months. Even in the latter, the men who go to the top are almost never those who prepared vocationally for their profession. They are in the majority of cases men who first acquired experience elsewhere, and thus gained the plasticity, the breadth, the imagination that a more general culture affords. The very best business brains in the country are not necessarily those of men who went through a business school. Within three years, our present economics will be laughed at, just as our present ideas on psychology, sociology and physics will become hopelessly outdated in ten or fifteen years. The medicine of 1970 will laugh condescendingly at our present drugs and curing techniques. While it is good to be informed on the state of knowledge in our own time, it is even better to adapt oneself readily to new knowledge, to be somewhat detached from the obsession of the immediate, and thus to remain open-minded and able to face ever-changing conditions in an ever-changing world.

The most important things in life, for which education would prepare young people better, if it forgot its narrow concern with being "directly useful," are in truth: 1) The ability to

express oneself, orally and in writing, which is pitifully disappearing in an age when even "successful business men" talk only in grunts and have ceased to write but dictate into machinery. 2) The ability to grow after one has left school which is not always conspicuous in alumni and alumnae. An Englishman suggested that we substitute for the conventional "How do you do?" form of greeting, and for its abbreviated American monosyllabic counterpart, a more pithy question such as "What are you reading these days?" It might indeed make it more instructive, and even more entertaining, to listen, on a bus or in the street, to the answers which such questions would elicit. 3) The ability to see ourselves with objectivity and humor, and to prove tolerant enough to others, individuals, groups and nations, to understand their ways. 4) Last but not least, the capacity to enjoy leisure. For, whatever our students do later in life, let us hope they will enjoy free hours and will know how to consume them pleasantly and refreshingly, listening to music, reading good books, understanding the plays or the paintings they see. The very word school used to mean leisure in Greek; and for centuries men who were not lazy praised idleness as the state in which man becomes most akin to the gods. No sight is more disheartening in our world than that of grave, staid gentlemen, hard-boiled salesmen, dignified matrons so stubbornly untouched by the landscape outside or by the sight of their fellow-sufferers in boredom that, as soon as they sit in the train or in their club, they rush to the paper, disregarding news and editorials, to devour the comic strips. At home, unable to face the ordeal of two hours of serene leisure, they avidly absorb the chewing-gum for the ears provided by their radio-program, or else turn greedily to the chewing-gum for the eyes of some television set. They even give the name of relaxing to such systematic impoverishment of their mental and spiritual life. Those who indulge in such relaxation often fall a prey to nervous breakdowns or to heart failures before they reach their fiftieth year.

The subject is one of tragic gravity. We are apparently living in the dawn of a new era. Recently discovered sources of energy will increase our mechanical facilities a hundred times and will provide us with more leisure than ever be-

fore. Are we going to devote that free time to listening to the virtues of Pepsi Cola or to devouring three detective stories a day, wondering childishly who killed whom, when both the killer and the victim never lived as creatures of flesh and blood in the first place? Should we not boldly reconsider the underlying assumptions behind much of our education, and admit that, the machine-builders, the engineers, the technicians of America having done wonders in their fields, it is time to shift the emphasis to other subjects and to reestablish a badly shaken equilibrium? The humanities, democratized, revitalized, modernized, and giving to modern languages what ancient languages have lost, have an important part to play in our mechanically-minded age. Industry and commerce tell us loudly what sort of men they want. Let us raise our voices and let industry and commerce know what their real needs are. A wise and imaginative pioneer in medical education, Abraham Flexner, warned us authoritatively years ago that "universities must at times give society not what society wants, but what it needs."

It needs languages more than ever today. A glance at our daily paper informs us of the thinking of our world and of the necessity to know about other nations and to have them know us better. "We must love one another, or die," wrote the poet W. H. Auden. Let us say that we must, at the very least, understand one another, or perish. We are engaged today in the process of broadening our allegiance from one nation to a group of United Nations, soon perhaps to the world. No amount of juridical explanations about the UN charter, about the need to import and thus bridge the dollar gap, or the expansion of the Point Four program, will be of much avail if we fail to develop a concrete and living interest in other nations as such: in their daily lives, in their outlooks and prejudices, in their exotic "backwardness," but also in the features by which they are similar to us, for we have long overstressed their superficial differences in our movies and in our textbooks. If language study were to succeed in ridding us of the naive and nefarious complacency stigmatized three hundred years ago by Pascal's aphorism, "*Vérité en deçà des Pyrénées, erreur au delà,*" it would prove the

most practical, indeed the most beneficent, of all the subjects studied in our schools.

The true usefulness of language study in no way consists in our retaining a skill in the mastery of a language that we once learned. It lies in helping us escape from the temptation of provincialism and all its narrowness. Even more than history which has tended lately to be concerned with the American scene, far more than social studies which have tended to dwell upon the statistical study of Middletown or Elms-town, it is a liberating study and education should be a liberation from what is base and narrow in ourselves, from what is too limited in our environment. The most constricting bondage to which we are all prone to be willing captives is the bondage of words. We take it for granted a little too readily that other people mean the same thing as we do (without always clarifying what we mean ourselves) when they use foreign equivalents for terms like "freedom," "democracy," "free press," "free enterprise," "peace," "socialism." But we are deceiving ourselves. UNESCO initiated in 1948 an inquiry into the meaning of the word democracy, to determine the different significance it seems to have for different peoples, even when those peoples enjoy a similar ethnical and cultural background. Such a semantic inquiry at once raises complex questions: on the relationship between political and economic democracy, on the necessity of parties in a democracy and of the danger that the multiplication of such parties may constitute, on the limits to be assigned to tolerance and freedom of speech in democracy, etc. An apparently unambiguous and familiar phrase such as that of the Gettysburg address, "government of the people, by the people, for the people," may raise several conflicts between divergent interpretations: "by the people" clearly must mean a few to whom the task of representing the many is delegated; but how few must the few be, and how must they be selected, and how are we to agree upon the interpretation of "for the people," etc?

The scientist Thomas Huxley expressed it tersely when in 1882 he said in an address to the Liverpool Institution: "One of the safest ways of delivering yourself from the bondage of words is to know how ideas look in words to which you are not accustomed. That is one

reason for the study of language." He added: "Another reason is the practical value of such knowledge. And yet another is this, that if your languages are properly chosen, from the time of learning the additional languages, you will know your own language better than you ever did."

* * * * *

We make no fetish of culture as such, or as it used to be snobbishly conceived. But we are convinced that a democracy is sliding down a perilous slope when too many of its citizens willfully ignore what the rest of the world thinks of them and stubbornly refuse to re-examine its fundamental assumptions, to interpret them to others whose cooperation we need today in America almost as much as they need ours. Vocational education has its limited value; but it has been pushed to ridiculous extremes and it has benefited employers and industrialists far more than it has the rank and file of our citizens. A professor of philosophy and of education who worked as a laborer till the age of twenty-one and who gained his own education the hard way, Eduard C. Lindeman, remarked that industry, faced with rapid expansion, asked the public schools to accept the responsibility and to face the cost for the training of its workers, but seldom plowed back the profits thus made to help the adult education of its workmen or to assist the public school system. He concluded: "I do not believe that public school education should be primarily vocational in purpose."³ German history of the last twenty years clearly showed what dangers a nation of efficient specialists may run into, if it imprisons itself into provincialism, into disregard of foreigners and uncritical acceptance of unworthy leaders blindly obeyed by the specialists in the anthill. The philosopher Bergson, long before he treated the same theme in his *Creative Evolution*, declared at the age of twenty-three in a speech delivered at the Lycée of Angers: "The inferiority of the animal lies in this: that it is a specialist. It does one thing to admiration: it can do nothing else." We owe it to the youth of this country to turn it

³ Eduard C. Lindeman, "The Goal of American Education," (p. 14) in *Democracy's Challenge to Education*—edited by Beula Amidon, New York, Farrar and Rinehart, 1940.

into something more than specialists—or than animals.

Indeed, an intelligent conception of democracy makes it imperative that we restore languages for all pupils in the schools at an early age, merely to be true to the American principle of equality of opportunity. The study of modern languages in our schools should by no means be limited, as a class privilege, to the fifteen per cent who are likely to go to college. It should be started early before inhibitions, self-consciousness and shyness hamper girls and boys at their puberty. It should be extended to as many people as possible. For why should children financially, geographically, or perhaps momentarily intellectually underprivileged be deprived of the opportunity of entering college some day, or of understanding the modern world in which America is incessantly in contact with foreigners, or merely of enjoying their leisure hours thanks to some literary, historical or linguistic interest.

Nothing is less truly democratic and more medieval in the popular and less honorable sense lent to the adjective, than for school principals and school boards to decide in advance that certain boys and girls will only be trained for their probable occupation and will be chained to their status in life; that they will in advance be shut out from the eventual opportunity to go to those colleges whose graduates earn, it is said, the highest incomes. A report of the British Ministry of Education, quoted in *School and Society* (July 18, 1925), declared in a true democratic spirit: "It has been well said that the purpose of education is not so much to prepare children for their occupations as against their occupations. It must develop in them the powers and interest that will make them the masters and not the slaves of their work."

The warnings repeatedly uttered by many of the great scientists, inventors, physicians and business leaders of our time should be heeded more solemnly than the assertions of naive educators who, having never mastered the study of language themselves, fail to see why the opportunity denied them should be granted others. Pasteur used to say that chance has much to do in one's career and in scientific discoveries; but he added that "chance favors the well-prepared

mind." Einstein was reported in an American journal as declaring: "If a young man has trained his muscles and his physical endurance by gymnastics and walking, he will later be fitted for every physical work." This is also analogous to the training of the mind.⁴ The case for language study as intellectual gymnastics hardly needs arguing. But more of us, members of the teaching profession, should put to parent-teachers associations the question: "Is your child being cheated?" We should incite parents to ask their local school boards that their children be granted a chance to study languages and thus receive their rightful claim to the social and intellectual benefits which too few are at present enjoying.

If foreign language study were generalized and started earlier, as logically it should be, more boys and girls would reach college already prepared to read the works of another literature besides those written in English. In our modern world, it is only second class citizens who should be content with having only one window open upon the world: that of one single language, of one single literary tradition. Reading foreign works in the original is an accomplishment which will only be reserved to a minority. But that minority is smaller in America than in any other great country, and it has lately been reduced to the defensive. A concern with objectivity, or with the appearances of objectivity, has led many Americans to lend their credence solely to quantitative data, questionnaires, charts, curves, statistics and percentages. Such methods are deceptive in their imitation of science. They are often mere pretexts for eschewing a decision. They also delude those who compile and use them into believing that they have understood the whys and the wherefores of human motives, while in fact that have only refused to follow the bolder but more constructive process of discovery in science as in life: namely the imaginative flash which works from observation to induction and to a hypothesis which endows data with a new significance.

The value of literature is manifold indeed: if

⁴ Einstein's speech at the Convocation of Regents of the University of the State of New York, November 1936, as quoted in an article by Charles A. Tonsor, "Foreign Languages Viewed by an Administrator," *Modern Language Journal*, XXII, No. 6 (March 1938) p. 408.

the modern world remains skeptical when we say that it affords a new appreciation of beauty, let us not blush before the word pleasure. Pleasure, in its higher form, is an essential part of happiness. But, contrary to an unfounded prejudice, literature, if it is broad enough to include the masterpieces of several cultures, may well be the most practical of all studies. History of the last fifty years in several countries has proved conclusively that statesmen who had been trained as engineers, as scientists, even as military or business men, have regularly failed when they attempted to lead men and to deal with human affairs in which irrational and unpredictable factors predominate. We have ourselves heard physicians, lawyers and politicians declare that no one should attempt to go into politics who has not mastered one art or one foreign literature.

British papers have more than once remarked since 1950 that the root of many British troubles in the Middle East and the Near East, and the root of similar mistakes now being committed by Americans lay in their narrow quantitative approach to problems which cannot be thus solved. A little curiosity for Iranian traditions as embodied in literature, or for the literary and cultural heritage of the Greeks, the Italians, the French, would have gone a long way in appealing to the emotional forces which, far more than economic necessity, impel those peoples to behave sentimentally, illogically, proudly.

We would even submit that, in so far as history is made by individuals interpreting collective forces and material needs around them, it can best be understood through literature.⁵ Dictators of the last two decades and would-be dictators or demagogic leaders of the present day are strikingly similar to characters in Balzac or Dostoevski. The reading of novels, in which characters are synthetically and globally created through the power of imagination, would enable more men and women to interpret the minds and hearts, the obsessions and the shrewdness of many a man of business and of many a statesman. And after all, for centuries, it has been the qualitative, intuitive and emotional approach (which fiction and drama exemplify) rather than the quantitative and coldly analytical one, which has proved the

most effective one with one half (and not the less essential one) of mankind: womankind.

The cause of languages in America today is not one that should be defended by language teachers alone. They can do much, to be sure, to establish unity of purpose and coordination of effort among the several languages; they should stress the historical and social values behind literature, give the study of French, German, Spanish a function in other fields through the light it throws on history, philosophy, sociology, etc., written in those languages and intimately bound up with those foreign literatures. Above all, teachers in the universities should make a more determined effort to break the barriers separating them from secondary and elementary school teachers, and those who train graduate students should once and for all give up their claim or pretense to be preparing only literary and philological scholars and to remain unconcerned in the teaching and in the human qualities of their students.

But the enemies of language study are not our own colleagues in education or in the social sciences whom we take an innocuous pleasure in mocking occasionally and thus tend to alienate. All those who teach the youth and who believe in maintaining and in extending culture in America at the present time are or can be our allies. Every language teacher should set himself the task of converting colleagues, students, parents and friends around him. The offensive in American education, which has practically eliminated the classics, has now attacked the modern languages. If it finds a soft spot there and wins, it will at once shift the onslaught to philosophy, to European history, to sociology, to English. Indeed, premonitory signs have not been lacking. Champions of "progress" have already intimated that it useless to learn how to

⁵ The words of a man who was not a literary scholar but who devoted his life to improving advanced studies in the sciences and in medicine are worth meditating: "In literature, man reveals himself and in literature man has, since the earliest times, revealed himself. If the proper study of mankind is man, the proper study of man is the literature that he has created through the centuries. No scientist, no psychoanalyst, no behaviorist had to teach the authors of Oriental texts and the Bible, Shakespeare, Molière, Dante and Goethe the proper relations between human beings." Abraham Flexner, *Funds and Foundations* (Harpers, 1952), pp. 132-33.

write English today: executives merely indicate in terse language to their secretaries how to answer letters and draw reports. Writing could thus be relegated to girls' colleges and secretarial schools. Unless we all unite today to resist the encroachment of the blind advocates of the immediately practical, we are in danger of hanging separately tomorrow.

For all of us, whether we dedicate ourselves to history or to French, to English or to anthropology, must agree that the dilemma for us is the following: shall we yield to those who stress the knowledge of the material means placed at the disposal of men, or shall we fight for a better knowledge of man himself? Shall we, in Bergson's famous phrase, attempt to enlarge and deepen our minds and grow a soul commensurate with man's overgrown body, favor the development of his power over matter which may ultimately destroy him or concentrate upon man as a creator? An American thinker published in England, in 1952, a book which presents the dilemma cogently: *Man Creator or Destroyer* (by George Malcolm Stratton, London, Allen and Unwin). He stressed the frightening dominion which man has gained over lifeless energies, "commanding their help in making persons from the raw stuff of human beings and in making communities from these persons." But man needs better knowledge of men, and not of the oil, coal and plutonium which are at his disposal, if he is to spare the world from annihilation.

Many a voice has lately cried that the worst American failure, since 1950, has been the failure to make this country understood, appreciated, liked abroad. That sad fact stemmed to a great extent from our inability to understand, to appreciate and to respect the very peoples of Europe, Asia and South America to whom we were extending material help with a generosity unheard of in historical annals. We now have to admit that no amount of economic and military assistance can ever replace a genuine interest in the culture, manners, sensibilities of other nations. Such an interest must begin with some regard for their language, the mirror to all that they hold dearest to them in their past and the symbol of their will to live.

American propagandists who naively want to transplant abroad the benefits which they deem

essential to their own comfort (64 page newspapers supposedly constituting a free press, corner drugstores, cellophane-wrapped lunches, quarterly checkup and homogenized and vitaminized candies) naturally draw the charge of economic imperialism. There is more than wit in George Bernard Shaw's advice: "Do not do unto others what you would like that they should do unto you. Their tastes may not be the same." The most generous, probably the best-humored nation in the world, the United States, thus happens to be envied, eyed with suspicion, feared and even hated by the very people whom it tried to serve.

Wisely has one of the educational leaders in this country lately declared that an American who knows the language, understands the culture and can predict the probable behavior of a foreign country, be it Korea or France, Iran or Germany, Russia or Argentina, is worth more to his country than several atomic physicists. The physicist might help win a war, through mass destruction, alas! and in Tacitus' immortal phrase, "establish a desert and call it peace." The informed and intelligent interpreter of other countries might prevent war.

The phrase, once sacrosanct, about America's "manifest destiny," aroused smiles on our lips in the skeptical era which preceded World War II. But history, in its capricious bestowing of favors and responsibilities, has at present showered upon the United States its dubious favors. The mission of America has perforce to be a soteriological one. This country must save the rest of the western world, or go down to ruin with it. It cannot succeed if it is isolated. It desperately needs the good will, the wholehearted cooperation, and the confidence of other nations. Those nations refuse to be bullied or treated with condescension. They must be wooed, through their culture and their language. "Help save the world through the study of languages" might well be our worthy motto. Let us thus, to the best of our ability, assist man now faced with an unavoidable dilemma, choose determinedly between the tasks of a creator or of a destroyer which the challenge of the second half of the twentieth century has laid before us.

HENRI PEYRE

Yale University

*Language Analysis and Language Teaching**

THE pages which follow are based on the belief that language teachers have an important job to do, and are devoted to doing it. Consequently, if scientific analysis of language produces results which are of use to the language teacher, and if linguistic scientists can state them in a usable form, these results should sooner or later reach the classroom. Unfortunately, linguistics has an awesome terminology, an uncomfortably rigid technique, and a body of attitudes which sometimes run counter to those established by long tradition and inculcated by much of our education. It is nonetheless possible to speak of linguistics with a minimum of special terminology, with presentation of results rather than exposition of techniques, and an avoidance of attitudes which would appear controversial to the reasonable non-linguist. If the linguist wishes to bring his results to the classroom, he must write of his science in just this spirit, and with humility.

The linguist's first statement about language is that it is made up of *sounds*. Other symbolic systems—writing, Morse Code, even hieroglyphics—are *secondary* representations, and are at best, substitutes for language. Even in our own literate community we learned to speak long before we learned to write, and we carry our daily affairs far more by means of speech than by writing. Yet, since writing enjoys prestige as a permanent record, as the vehicle of literature and as the basis of education, it is easy to forget its secondary position. Many people, therefore, regard writing as the fundamental part of language which is only imperfectly and ephemerally represented by speech. As a result, many statements about language are really about writing.

Most language teachers realize that their first task is to train students to manipulate a set of sound symbols. Even if the aim is to teach the student to read and translate rather than speak, the student must have some means of responding to what he sees with something that he hears. If he can make no sounds at all, he has

such a narrow field of stimulation that he will not learn the sequences of letters he is being taught. In some situations—a Latin class, for instance—his sounds do not have to be those of a native, but sounds he has to have, and they have to be systematically enough arranged so that he can make differing responses for all the differing items that make up the language. In a modern language, his set of sounds must be as nearly as possible those of a native, since on the very lowest level he must communicate orally, at least with his teacher, who presumably has such a native or near-native set.

Although it is easy to confuse writing and speech, in the language classroom it is disastrous to do so, since if sound and speech are to be taught and mastered, they must be clearly presented. Language teachers can do much to bring about the necessary clarity by examining textbooks to see how well they present the sounds of the tongues they describe. Here are some simple rules by which a textbook can be judged. The rules take the form of descriptions of typically bad presentation, followed by contrasting descriptions of good presentation. The rules will be general and, it is hoped, applicable to the teaching of French, Spanish, German, or even English as a foreign language.

A *bad* book covers the pronunciation of the foreign language in no more than five or six pages. It presents its material in terms of letters and their "values," a term that is enough in itself to make the reader suspicious. A typical bad book presents in five and a half pages the pronunciation of Provençal for speakers of French. Its first statement reads as follows: "The Provençal alphabet has twenty-three letters, five of which are vowels, and eighteen of which are consonants, pronounced as follows: 1. A, a, *a* preserve their alphabetic value." We have all seen many such descriptions, not only of rarer languages like Provençal, but of the

* Paper read at the Foreign Language Program session at the Modern Language Association meeting in Chicago, December 1955.

great languages we are ordinarily called on to teach. All such descriptions seriously confuse speech and writing, and so make the teaching of speech more difficult.

A bad book, when it ventures to describe sounds at all, does so in vague or confusing terms. This Provençal grammar says that one sound "is pronounced *ts* or *tz* in a fashion intermediate between Spanish *muchacho* and Italian *barbozza*." The statement explains the unknown by the more unknown, since two other languages besides French and Provençal are introduced, only to say that Provençal is like neither of them. Sometimes the explanation can be merely verbal, as in the following drawn from a text which has been widely used in American classrooms. Of two sets of contrasting consonant types, one is called "soft and liquid," the other "hard and dry." The explanation is merely an elaboration of the folk term for one set, which is often called *soft*. If a text calls the vowels of a continental language clearer and more musical than their English equivalents, it is committing the same fault.

Even beyond the section on pronunciation, a bad book shows the effects of confusion between letters and sounds. Far too many grammars of English as a foreign language contain a statement we can remember from our own days in the schoolroom—"the plural of nouns is formed by adding *-s* or *-es*." Such a statement conceals the fact that there are three regular plurals, that found in *dogs*, that in *cats*, that in *horses*. (Pronounce them.) Speakers of Spanish who have learned their English from such books, not unnaturally have difficulty in handling the distinction between *dogs* and *docks*. Not that spelling does not have its place in language instruction. A general principle, however, is that *spelling is useful only when the student knows what it is that is being spelled*. The quoted rule for the formation of the plural disregards this principle.

There is a second type which need not hold us long. Such books describe sounds, but in terms of the native language alone. They usually provide a system of spelling to indicate the pronunciation of words and phrases. The re-spelling, however, is not consistent and is meant to be read without special training, solely by means of the *native alphabetic tradition*. These books have their uses—for Latin they may be all that

is needed. Most "phrase-books," telling the reader how to master French in six easy lessons, are prepared on this principle. Sometimes the re-spelling is remarkably ingenious, as in this from a phrase-book for GI's: "*Rheims* is pronounced like English *Rance*." Yet ingenious or not, all such presentations are open to a serious objection. They reinforce the student's naive belief that all languages are alike except for the words in them, and convince him that there is really little to learn.

In the paragraphs which follow, I shall try to say what a good book does about pronunciation. I should make it clear at the start, however, that I do not believe any description of sounds and how they are made can be a substitute for imitation of native or near-native speech. Furthermore, the younger the learner, the more reliance there should be on imitation, and the less on description. The purpose of description, and of drills based on description, is student's attention to exactly what he is trying to imitate, giving him some control of the mechanism of imitation, and organizing the drills so as to focus imitation on only a few features at a time, features which are then repeated until a habit is set up. Description of sounds, indeed, does not directly instruct the learner in how to produce them, and fails in any instance where the articulating organs are out of conscious control. Thus the *rr* of Spanish *perro* can not be taught to an English speaker who does not have it, by describing the action of the tongue. The teacher has to start from one of the many practical devices which have long been used in the classroom, such as modification of the *brr* which in English means "I'm cold." Similarly the guttural *r* of some varieties of German can be taught by starting from a snore. On the other hand, in all instances where the articulation can be consciously controlled, description is an indispensable tool. A Spaniard can be most easily taught to pronounce an English final *m*, for instance, by being told to close his lips. The usefulness of a good description is not denied if we recognize the truism that no one can learn a good pronunciation by reading about it. It is usual for all books except those for the youngest students to give some sort of systematic account of pronunciation. Such accounts must be as accurate as possible,

and must not confuse the learner.

What then does a *good* book do about pronunciation? First, it describes the sounds of the foreign language accurately and fully *in terms of articulation*. It tells the reader, for example, that the tip of the tongue is against the back surface of the teeth in pronouncing a French or Spanish *t*. When the description has been given, it invites the student and teacher to compare articulatory positions in the native and the foreign language, so as to verify the difference described, and give the student a means of self-criticism. It may even recommend the use of a mirror, or feeling with the fingers, to observe articulation. Typically, there will be comparison of English *two* and Spanish *tu*, or the like. The student will be given the opportunity to observe that the first English sound (the *t*) is articulated farther back than the Spanish, and to hear the acoustic difference which results.

Second, a good book uses *terminology* which is technical, it is true, but accurate and fully explained. Thus in describing the *t* in *two* and *tu* it introduces the term *aspiration*, and explains that it means the puff of air which can be felt as part of the release of the *t* in *two*, but which is absent in *stew* and Spanish *tu*. It again invites student and teacher to verify by comparing the English and Spanish words. Such accurately defined terminology contrasts sharply with impressionistic names and descriptions. Student and teacher, once provided with the term *aspiration*, have a quick means of correction. The teacher can say, "Watch out, Mr. Jones, don't aspirate," and Mr. Jones knows what is meant and what to do about it. If the teacher can only say, "Make your *t* sharper and more metallic," the chances are Mr Jones will go right on making an English *t* as he would have without any instruction at all.

A good book takes up matters of *accent* and *intonation*. If it is presenting English for the foreigner, it points out that *brief case* and *briefcase* are distinguished by their accents, a matter which speakers of a language with a different system of accentuation from our own, like Spanish or French, will slight unless they are warned to observe it. A good book will not stop with one or two examples, but will give a whole series of contrasting accent forms:

I saw him by the bank.

I saw him buy the bank.

the greenhouse
the green house
the Green house

light grey stone blocks
light-grey stone blocks
light greystone blocks

The forms given are a few illustrations only from the many where distinctions in accent identify different utterances in English. The difference in accent should be presented, also, not merely for intellectual understanding, but as fundamental parts of the language, with copious drills. Intonation should be similarly treated, presenting the contrast between *John went home*, and *John went home?* for English, and furthermore, contrasting the intonation of the foreign language when it differs. Thus the intonation of some sentences of command differ in English and German. If an English sentence like "Mary, let's go home now," is contrasted with its literal equivalent in German, "Maria, lass uns jetzt nach Hause gehen," the German sentence shows a finality, a downward intonation, on the name *Maria*, like that we would give a word standing alone as a complete sentence. If we give the English sentence the same kind of treatment, "Mary. Let's go home now," we are being brusque or rude; in German, such treatment is merely normal and not associated with rudeness at all. The difference is not without social importance—we often react to German intonation patterns as if the German were being intentionally "Prussian." A good book presents all such matters of accent and intonation as parts of the language pattern, which differentiate utterances from one another, which vary from language to language, and which have to be learned by the student like all other linguistic habits.

A good book is written from a thorough knowledge of the *structure* of both the native language and the foreign language. Its presentation of pronunciation is in terms of the similarities and differences between the two, and therefore recognizes that presentation of the same foreign language necessarily differs for two groups with differing native language. The description of Spanish for English students warns them that English diphthongizes the vowels in a phrase like "pay so" and that this is therefore not an equivalent of Spanish *peso*. Such a warning would be superfluous in a grammar designed for speakers of French or Italian. Again, in a grammar of Spanish for speakers of English,

little attention need be given to the Castilian pronunciation of a word like *cinco* or *lápiz*, since English has a readily available equivalent or near-equivalent. For a speaker of French or German, such a sound would need careful description, and directions for its production.

A good book presents sounds not alone in terms of what they are, but *how they are arranged*, again with careful attention to similarities and differences between foreign language and native language. For instance, it is not enough to say that Spanish has sounds approximately like (though with differences of detail) the *d* of *den* and the *th* of *then*. A good book explains that in normal Spanish, the *d* sounds occurs after most consonants and pause, the *th* sound between vowels. That is, *donde* has *d*'s, but in the phrase *a donde*, the first *d* becomes a *th*. A part of the arrangement of sounds, also, are the transitions between them. In consequence, a good book for Spanish would say that in ordinary conversation the two sentences *¿Es un hombre?* and *¿Es su nombre?* would be indistinguishable.

The kind of transitional pauses which an English speaker puts in to mark his word boundaries are often absent in Spanish—as many a student has found out to his sorrow when he hears natives speak the language he has painfully studied in school. Again, a part of arrangement of sounds is their sequences. Thus a good grammar of Spanish points out that the nasal consonants of *un padre* and *un tio* are different, since Spanish does not permit the sequence *np* without intervening pause. English does permit such sequences, so that the student must be warned against them.

The most important point yet mentioned is that a good book presents pronunciation in terms of *contrasts*, and of contrasts as they appear in normal and complete sentences. It is next to useless simply to list and describe English or French vowels. The sounds must be presented in words such as *ship* and *sheep* for English, *palle* and *pate* for French, and these contrasts then further placed in sentences such as "I saw a big ship," and "I saw a big sheep." Individual contrasts are not to be avoided; rather, once given, they should be illustrated from sentences which actually occur in speech.

A good book presents material on pronuncia-

tion, not only in its introductory chapters, but throughout the work, in terms of *systematic re-spelling, always together with ordinary orthography*. Since such systems may, however, be used in confusing and harmful ways, some explanation of their purpose is necessary. Even with the so-called phonetic language like Spanish and Finnish, the ordinary orthography does not record all of the language. The features of pause, much of accentuation, and intonation have to be supplied by the teacher. If they are also given by a system of re-spelling in the textbook, the teacher's task is greatly lightened. With a language like English the importance of the re-spelling is much greater. Not only does English make many distinctions like that between the initial sounds of *thy* and *thigh* which are not shown in spelling at all, but has sequences like *-ough* in *though*, *through*, *cough*, *enough*, and *bough* which have to be learned item by item. Time is therefore saved by a re-spelling which is consistent.

Re-spelling is no more than an aid to the learning of pronunciation, and secondarily an aid to learning the system by which pronunciation is partially recorded in orthography. If either book or teacher uses it otherwise, it is harmful. Damage was recently done unintentionally by a book prepared as a manual for writers of textbooks. The manual presented drills in re-spelling alone, leaving it to the textwriters to supply the orthographic version. When the book was unavoidably pressed into service as a textbook, students and teachers not unnaturally complained that they had to learn a "language of phonetics" and then learn English all over again after that. Again, as soon as a student or a class accomplishes the aims for which the re-spelling was devised, further attention to the system can be dropped. Yet since it is impossible for a textwriter to predict at exactly what point such mastery will be achieved, he provides the re-spelling throughout the book. If his student realizes that the re-spelling is provided as an aid, and not as something extra that must be mastered for itself, it is normally true that he will make good use of it. A not uncommon experience for teachers of English as a second language in classes which use some of the books now available in complete and systematic re-spelling, is to have

members of the class correct an inadvertent misreading of intonation or accent.

It was stated above that the re-spelling should be used throughout the book. An instance of its usefulness in sections other than those on pronunciation would be that a good statement of English noun plurals would say that there are three regular endings, /-s/, /-z/, /-iz/, using re-spelling to indicate their sound, and using it further to indicate the sounds after which each one occurs. Moreover, when instruction in spelling is given, the sounds are first presented in the already learned re-spelling, and then the way they are represented in ordinary orthography is systematically explained. A useful English spelling rule is that a single consonant letter between vowel letters is an indication that the first vowel letter represents a diphthong, while two consonant letters in the same situation indicate that the first vowel letter spells a simple vowel. The rule is useless unless the student knows a re-spelling which gives the first vowel of *liking* as a diphthong, and the first vowel of *licking* as a simple vowel. The re-spelling is used not only in the introductory chapters, in grammatical presentation, in the treatment of spelling, but throughout in the drills which should accompany each chapter.

In the preceding pages we have been working with a single explicit assumption, that language is sound. Yet there has been another assumption implicit in all that we have said. This is that *sounds make patterns of contrasts*, and that these patterns differ from language to language quite as much as do the sounds themselves. The different treatment of *d* and *th* sounds in Spanish and English is an instance of pattern difference more important than difference in sound entities. The notion of patterning extends not only to sound, but to all parts of language, to grammar, syntax, and even to vocabulary. It is important to make the student recognize that when he has learned a vocabulary correspondence like *hand*—*mano* he has not yet learned all that is necessary, since Spanish employs *mano* where we would use *coat* in a *coat of varnish*, *una mano de barniz*. The patterning of grammar and vocabulary items is as important, and as unpredictable, as the patterning of sounds.

A third related assumption is that it is the formal differences in sound which make the dif-

ferences in larger items, and so in turn make the differences in meaning possible. Differences in meaning are therefore best arrived at through study of the formal differences. The contrary assumption is that differences of meaning impose the formal differences, which are therefore secondary and unimportant. Yet the formal differences are the signals to which we respond, and which give us our knowledge of the meaning differences. If the reader says the two sentences, "They didn't have money to eat," and "They didn't have bread to eat," he will of course recognize that the phrase "to eat" has a different function in the two. If he compares his pronunciation of both, he should be able to recognize that *eat* gets a stronger accent in the first than in the second. Now let him try the first sentence with a nonsense word in place of *money*, "They didn't have *cadsov* to EAT." Pronounced in this way it is clear that *cadsov* is the same kind of thing as money, and is not something edible like bread.

Now does this assumption work out in the presentation of grammatical material? First, a good book presents drills designed to give the student habitual mastery of formal patterns; it does not present formal or even semantic principles as sole and sufficient guides. Thus for a Chinese student of English, sentences like "It's a nice day," must be drilled until they became an easily manipulated model into which other utterances like "It's raining," "It's hot" and so on, can be fitted. Only if this mastery is given, will accompanying explanation of the use of the fictitious pronoun subject be fully useful.

Yet since books for more mature students find it useful to present systematic grammatical description as a supplement to drill, the assumption given necessarily affects this systematic reference material also. A *bad* book presents its account of grammatical classes *primarily in terms of meaning*. A *good* book presents them first *in terms of their formal characteristics*, with descriptions of meaning only after the formal characteristics have been used to isolate and identify the entities described. A typical bad presentation is one that we all remember—"A pronoun is a word used instead of a noun." The definition does not define, since if a pronoun is a noun used for another noun, the definition is not needed. If on the other hand, a pronoun is

not a noun, we are left to wonder what it is. A typically good presentation—and fortunately there are many such—begins by giving the inflectional forms of pronouns and, since the class is not large, listing the words that share them. Only thereafter does such a book go on to say that pronouns are used as noun substitutes, and to give the conditions under which the substitution takes place. In dealing with nouns, a good presentation begins by saying that English nouns have two cases and two numbers, and can be preceded by articles and adjectives in the same phrase. When such characteristics have been given, it may go on to say that nouns correspond fairly well with the category of things in the real world. A good presentation will, however, never use a category of “thingness” to define such a word as *whiteness* or *penetration* as a noun. Definition, in short, should precede description. If the class of nouns has first been isolated so that the student knows what words belong in the class, description of the class is genuinely useful, though of course its value is in contributing to the intellectual understanding of language structure, not to the learning of language habits. To draw a parallel, one would not attempt to decide that a particular living being was a man or an ape by describing all the important accomplishments of mankind; it would be far more useful to stick to the anthropologists’ defining differential “man alone has an opposed thumb.”

The attitude that it is better to work through the formal characteristics to arrive at functions and meanings affects the presentation of language material in other ways also. In general, a book is to be condemned if it sets up classes for which there are no formal differentiating characteristics, or which conflict with them. Usually the reason for setting up such classes is an introduction of history at a point where it is confusing, or an attempt to fit all languages into a classic mold. Thus, for instance, it is defensible to talk about uses of the verb in English which correspond to subjunctive forms in other languages. Such forms as “if this *be* treason” can then be called subjunctive uses. It is certainly wasteful to set up a complete paradigm for a subjunctive mood in English, however, since all the forms which occur in subjunctive uses occur elsewhere in the verb inflection, and there are no

special subjunctive endings. Again, in the treatment of English verb forms for the learner of the language it is confusing to list the forms according to their various Old English classes, as at least one grammar does. In the presentation of German, the historical origin of the umlaut vowels can easily be pressed beyond the point of usefulness. Yet a simple structural parallel between the umlaut plurals of *man* and *Mann* may well interest the student and act as a worthwhile mnemonic device.

The presentation of grammatical material, syntactic patterns, even of vocabulary differences, like the presentation of sounds, proceeds from a thorough knowledge of both the native and the foreign language. Such a knowledge is not merely the ability to speak both languages fluently, but is much more an analysis of both structures, and the resultant ability to describe both similarities and differences. A good book wastes little time, however, with the similarities, and directs its attention instead to the differences. A Spanish grammar for speakers of English need not list all the uses of the Spanish definite article, since many are similar to English. An instance of what should be pointed out is the Spanish use of the definite article with parts of the body and intimate possessions, where we use a pronoun possessive. That is, Spanish says “he bumped the head,” where we say “his head.” If on the other hand, Spanish is being presented for speakers of a Slavic tongue, the treatment of the definite article will have to be full and detailed. Once more, the problem is different for each language group.

Next, a good book provides *drills* for all phases of the material presented. So indeed, do many bad books, though with a difference. A *bad book presents a set of sentences to be laboriously translated*, employing many different constructions in any one of which the student can make a mistake. We all remember the sets of Latin sentences, employing ablative absolutes, gerunds and gerundives, accusatives of extent of time, and so on, through which we struggled. Such sentences could be solved only like crossword puzzles, and for most of us they never led to any fluency in Latin. Drills which present the student with the whole of the language at once always make him stop and think and search his memory for the right form. Yet to talk we have

to be so habituated to the proper form that it comes out automatically. If we have to search for it, the conversation has left us long before we arrive at the proper answer. Drills which consist solely of paradigms may be a hindrance, since students often cannot bring out the proper form without running over the whole set first. A familiar example of this sort of fault is the student who cannot name the day of the week without starting with Monday.

A well constructed drill turns on a single contrast, and asks the student only to supply the proper form A or form B, always within a single frame. A proper drill for English might turn on this simple sentence frame:

I _____ go to the bank, this morning.

The blank should be filled with normal verbs like *want*, *hope*, *plan* and so on, all of which must be followed by *to*, and then by *can*, *may*, *will* and *shall* which omit the *to*. The drill should give ample opportunity for oral practice, until the student acquires a habit, much in the fashion that an American child acquires the habit of using or dropping *to* in this construction, before he is five years old. *Can go* and *want to go* represent a basically formal and arbitrary difference, and here as often in language no semantic or historical discussion is very helpful. The learner of English does not need to know the intricacies of preteritive-present verbs in Germanic; he needs only the habit of saying *can go*.

A good approach to such a Spanish problem as order in adjectives will similarly be based on drill, and, as we have been trying to suggest, the drill will be split into separate sets, each involving a small point in structure. A good drill can be made on nothing more than Spanish *todos* and *ambos*. *Todos* has many of the same order characteristics as English *all*, and there is one-for-one correspondence between *todos los hombres* and *all the men*. But *ambos* does not go with *todos* in the same way that *both* goes with *all*. That is, we can say *all the men*, or *both the men*: in Spanish, on the other hand we can say only *todos los hombres*, not *ambos los hombres*. Subsequent drills, based on accurate surveys of Spanish habits, would then be devoted to adjectives which occur before and after the noun, those which occur in both positions with change of meaning, those which occur in both

positions with change of form, and so on.

A good book does not present a language as a set of contrasts in a vacuum, but rather as a system which is intimately connected with other human activities, habits, and values. Indeed, it is ultimately this connection that we are talking about when we say that language has meaning, and which gives language its transcendent importance in our daily lives. A presentation of German should give the conditions under which a German addresses another as *du*, and will compare these with the conditions under which an American uses a first name. Not the least value of such an approach is that it brings into the student's awareness some of his own cultural habits, which he has probably taken for granted as instinctive. The German book should also pay some attention to the body movements which accompany speech, pointing out that Germans of different social status stand slightly farther from each other in talking than do speakers of similar status in English. This kind of information should then be related to the description of the use of *du*. There should also be some mention of levels of usage, realistically described in terms of the social responses that variant forms call forth. It should be emphasized that all such correlation with other habits and with social values is not a mere "talking about the language," of the sort rightly condemned as a turning aside from learning it. It is rather the necessary flesh and blood which makes a skeleton a living body.

The mention of the correlation of language with a community's set of values brings us inevitably to the subject of literature and reading in the language classroom. The emphasis so far given has been on language as speech, so that a false impression may have been inadvertently created. Literature is of the greatest importance in language training, and is often enough the student's real aim in study. But before such reading can be profitable, a good deal of preliminary training is necessary. The great works of literature abroad, as at home, are often considerably removed from contemporary speech. Such works as *Don Quixote* or *Hamlet* can be meaningfully read only when the student has gained some command of the patterns of the language. Since we cannot carry on conversation in Spanish of the Golden Age, or in

Elizabethan English, the only way in which the student can be drilled in language patterns is through practice in living speech. The aim of those who want to read literature has then to be the same in the beginning stages as for those who want to learn the language so as to get a job abroad—for that matter, the same as those who merely want to meet a language requirement. All must be given skill in handling speech patterns. Specialization comes later.

For these reasons, the classics do not belong in the beginning class. Most of us have seen the results of premature literary study in the foreigner who has been dragged through a Shakespeare play but is unable to communicate in any recognizable form of English. In the beginning class, the place of the classics might well be taken by carefully graded readers whose content is the normal habits and beliefs of the foreign community—for instance, Spanish habits of dress. For lack of such training on both sides of the language barrier, American tourists often give offense by dressing in shorts on the street, and Latins all too often have an impression of immorality in American life based on just this American ignorance of foreign ways.

The content of the reader should be presented in a structurally organized fashion. That is, each section should make use of a single type of grammatical contrast. Happily there is at least one such reader for English, in which home life in an average American town is so described. Each chapter deals with some such structural point as "it is raining now" in contrast with "it rains every day." The language should be simplified in two ways. There should not be much strange vocabulary. The new words and phrases should be given at a constant rate, and with constant re-employment. The vocabulary should be carefully scrutinized to make sure that new items do not slip in carelessly. An otherwise excellent reader contains a school-girl's question, "Where's my English book?" The phrase evidently slipped by the compiler without his realizing that it is a special construction, "book for a class in English literature or composition," not the more predictable phrase "book from England."

The second sense in which the language should be simplified is in the number of grammatical constructions used. If the simplification

is in vocabulary alone, the result is to throw complicated constructions at the student before he is ready for them. A horrifying example of such simplification of vocabulary without simplification of constructions is this sentence brought to me by a Japanese student of English from the first chapter of her reader: "It is thinking that makes what we read our own." Often in readers where the vocabulary has been thus simplified, it is easy to discover an underlying confusion between the adult foreigner and the native child. One whole series of English readers for foreigners is organized around keeping the vocabulary monosyllabic. The simplified language must be strictly natural. Often enough it is quaint and unpredictable, as in this sentence from an English reader in use in Italy—"What does Miss Blackhead bid?" (Miss Blackhead is a teacher of English, not a bridge player.) A slightly less repulsive example is this from a reader widely used in America—"After she had powdered her face. . . ." (American girls usually powder their noses.) More importantly, grammatical simplification may be done so as to do violence to structure. In a set of English materials used in the Orient, all verbs are used in the simple present ("It rains now,") in the early chapters, because the "is raining" construction is regarded as too difficult.

Up to this point we have been talking about how the language teacher can select already prepared material. Far more important is what he does in his own classroom. Much of what will be said on this subject is application of the same principles which govern the compilation of a good text. Much more is confirmation of what has been practiced in language classes by good teachers at any time. The linguistic scientists' recommendations are not new or revolutionary doctrine, but simply recommendations of what those linguists who are also practical language teachers have found to be effective.

Many language teachers are now provided with books which use the type of re-spelling described earlier. Such a text puts a burden on the teacher, since he must learn to read it in a consistent fashion, giving the sounds, accent, and intonation that the re-spelling calls for. The task, however, is not as heavy as the unfamiliarity of the symbols would suggest. The teacher already has command of the language,

so that if he pronounces a sentence at all, it will be in a possible form. The re-spelling is consistent, so that when sound and symbol are correlated, they are learned once and for all. Any such text will provide descriptions of acceptable dialect variants, and direct the teacher to use his natural form when there is such an alternative. The re-spelling does not direct him to learn a new kind of speech, since he already speaks in an acceptable fashion. If he pronounces Spanish *cinco* with an *s* or *beard* without an *r*, he need do no more than call the attention of his class to a dialect variant. When it is once possible to read the re-spelling consistently, the teacher is repaid in the speed and accuracy with which he can make distinctions and corrections. He can also lead his class to pronounce sentences that sound like natural and expressive language, not like separate and meaningless words.

The teacher will often be called on to design oral drills supplementing those he takes from his text. All that has been said about good and bad drills applies as well to those the teacher designs as to those he merely adopts. In pronunciation, the first drills should be in recognition of the foreign distinctions, with the student responding by number or some other device which does not involve producing the foreign sounds. Ability to recognize by no means guarantees ability to produce, but a student has no chance of producing a distinction until he has learned to hear it.

At later stages, reading aloud is useful. The first reading should be of texts already learned from a version in the re-spelling, read without reference to the re-spelling except for correction. When the students advance to reading without the re-spelling aid, the aim should be to see that they recognize the correlation, imperfect though it may be, between punctuation and the expressive properties—accent, intonation, pause—of speech. It is a minor point, but one worth making, that it is by no means always necessary to make a student translate a passage to determine whether he has understood it. If he reads the passage expressively, this is often evidence enough of understanding. After reading exercises have been introduced, dictation can be employed, again with the same aim, that of drilling on the correlation between punctuation and the expressive qualities of speech. Dictation

should never be given in the form "John went home question mark," but naturally, leaving the student to recognize that the sentence is a question from the way it sounds.

Drills should be as nearly as possible at normal speed, allowing the student to catch up by pauses placed at normal breaks in the sentence. It is important to recognize that slow speech is often—if not usually—distorted speech. If the teacher is able to train himself to slow speech which is not distorted, slow speech becomes very valuable indeed, but such training is difficult. Speakers, at least of the literate Western languages, have long been trained in a bookish formal style used when speaking slowly, and which differs greatly from the forms of conversation. When a speaker of a Western language slows his speech, he automatically falls into the bookish style. A sentence like "Don't you want a cup of coffee?" employs forms like "doncha" and "cuppa" in all normal conversation, though it is difficult to represent such forms in ordinary spelling without creating a false impression of illiteracy, which is a heritage of dialect writing. The reader should compare a slow and a rapid pronunciation of the sentence. In slow speech he will use separate and distinct consonants for *don't* and the following pronoun, a clearly pronounced *t* in *want*, and an equally clearly pronounced *v* (not *f* of course) in *of*. In rapid speech all these features are slurred, by both educated and uneducated speakers. It is not here argued that the conversational style is best for all purposes; rather it is maintained that the conversational style is a normal and necessary part of the language, and not a mark of carelessness or lack of education.

If the teacher can produce slow speech only in the bookish style, his only chance of introducing students to the conversational style that they must master if they are to use the language, is to talk at conversational tempo. If the teacher is enough of a virtuoso to be able to say "doncha" at half speed and without distortion then he has at his disposal one of the most effective teaching devices there is. The distorting effect of the bookish style is amply borne out by classroom experience. With learners of English, one of the first tasks is to convince them that Americans really say things like "I'm going," or "I'll go," instead of the formal "I am going"

and "I will go." They have seen the formal style in books and think of it as normal, so that they have great difficulty with even such simple conversational sentences as those given.

What the teacher does in his classroom can be seriously affected, for good or bad, by his ideas of usage. The teacher should use as good and as educated a form of speech as he can, but if his speech is not that of some body of native speakers, he is a bad model. I have known at least one teacher of German who regularly pronounced all *hs*, even that of *gehen*, a pronunciation as unreal as insisting on the first *d* in *Wednesday*. A markedly formal pronunciation, if genuine even though uncommon, like the stage pronunciation of German, can be objected to only if it is the only type to which the student is exposed. If he gets some practice in a more conversational style, but himself adopts the stage pronunciation, he should be able to understand and to talk, both acceptably.

All good teachers are aware of differences in rapid and slow style, and informal and formal speech, and all attempt to deal with them in some fashion. Yet a common solution to the problem is to try to produce a compromise style suitable for all occasions. Standard languages serve a part of this purpose, and should always be taught to the exclusion of local dialects, or speech without social prestige. Yet the attempt to construct a single form of speech for all class purposes is open to some objections. The matter of speed of utterance can be controlled, but the effects of speed can not. If the sentence used is "Don't you want a cup of coffee?" there comes a point in any series of utterances graded by speed, at which there is a dividing line between the bookish and the colloquial forms. The only way in which a compromise form could be set up would be to give, say, the bookish form for *don't you*, and the colloquial form for *cup of*. Since such compromise forms are therefore apt either not to be genuine compromises, or to be unreal mixtures, it is simpler and more accurate to expose the student systematically to more than one type of speech, of the sorts that he is likely to encounter.

Far more serious than an unreal type of speech is confusion between native mistakes and those the foreigner is prone to. The native mistakes are the use of a form belonging to a

definite social level on another level of higher prestige, which makes the form inappropriate. The foreigner's mistakes are carry-overs from his native language, so that the form produced is not English at all. The confusion has been very frequent in classes of English for foreigners, since until recently teachers of such classes usually had a background solely in instruction of native speakers. Thus an English class for speakers of Polish at least once spent a whole session on the proper use of *shall* and *will*, and I know of a book for speakers of Chinese which warns very carefully against splitting infinitives. Both of these mistakes would be committed only by a native. A foreigner who actually splits an infinitive is making progress toward some form of colloquial English, perhaps not just what we would choose for him, but progress none the less. In short, a teacher should produce an acceptable variety of the foreign language, and not worry too much over whether he speaks exactly like his colleagues. If they too produce an acceptable variety, it is to the student's advantage to become acquainted with more than one normal type. Again, the teacher should examine his list of errors to be avoided, and make sure that they are errors the foreigner is prone to. If they are native errors, he can well dismiss them from his mind. For speakers of Spanish a genuine error is failure to distinguish *no* and *not*; an occasional form like *he don't* can be dismissed with no more than passing mention.

Two matters can conclude this discussion. The first is the "direct method," still used, though no longer without modification, in most schools. Throughout these pages it has been said, in as many ways as possible, that language is pattern—patterns of sound, of words, of phrases and sentences. The native speaker moves through these patterns, making expansions, substitutions, and contractions without thinking about them, without real awareness. The patterns have become habits so deeply embedded in the early years of his adjustment to his community that they seem to him almost instinctive. There is no way in which an adult can acquire a new set of such habits except by initial intellectual understanding, backed by drill which transforms the understanding into automatic response. The intellectual under-

standing is of great value to the adult, but without the following drill it is useless. *The direct method, rigidly followed, gives no initial understanding of the patterns, since it rules out communication in the known tongue.* Similarly, it gives drill, it is true, but seldom in the systematic form which is most helpful.

In its history, the direct method was a healthy revolt against over-complicated grammatical analysis, and against the translation approach. It has the virtue of exposing the student to large amounts of the foreign tongue, and *succeeds better than any method which does not do so.* It is a truism that one cannot learn French by talking about it; one learns French by talking French. In practice, however, *the direct method assumes that the adult learner is exactly like the native child, unsophisticated in any language* and with five years or more in which to do nothing but learn to talk. The amount of time the direct method can waste is, to say the least, discouraging. A teacher who begins with a sentence like "los libros están en la mesa," without some reference to translation, gets a collection of random guesses like "made of wood," "in English," "in front of you," and so on.

A sensible plan, instead of the direct method, is *initial explanation, as accurate and simple as possible, in the native language, followed by drill* aimed at the acquisition of patterns. Each sentence learned should be a frame for expansion and substitution, so that the student begins to talk controlled and minimal bits of the language. Such a Spanish sentence as that given above should be followed by substitution drill using such words as *silla, sala*, to be followed by others with change of gender or number. The aim of all such drill can be summed up by saying its purpose is to teach a little of the language at a time very well, rather than a lot of the language at once and badly.

The last matter is the vexed question of the native or non-native teacher. The native teacher often enjoys a prestige which his American colleagues do not reach. Yet to say that only a native can teach a language is nearly equivalent to saying that no one can learn a second language. It is true that an adult almost never learns a new tongue without slight trace

of a foreign accent, so that it is always important that students hear considerable native speech as a model. But except for this, there is little to choose between native and well-trained American. Granted that the American commands the language, his excellence as a teacher depends on his professional competence as a classroom teacher, as explainer of language forms, and as designer of effective drills. If the teacher is a native, his excellence depends on the same qualifications, plus the fact that what he gains in command of the language to be learned he may lose in command of English.

In many schools, however, no native speaker is available, so that American teachers have no one to consult if they wish to investigate a point of usage, and the students have no perfect model for pronunciation. In such a situation much can yet be done. One modern solution is extensive use of recordings. Another is a determined search for a native, not to act as a member of the faculty, but as an assistant whose job it is to talk, so that he can be observed and imitated. In all large cities and even in many small ones such native models are available, sometimes on a volunteer basis. One native can enormously improve the teaching situation by making recordings, or by coming to class at intervals and talking long enough to convince the students that what they are studying is a genuine and living vehicle of human communication.

In closing I return to my starting point. Language teachers have an important job, and they are devoted to doing it. Linguistic scientists also have an important job, to which they are also devoted. Their results are fragmentary—as are those of all science—but important, and growing in importance. It is unthinkable that the enormous task of unlocking the language barrier will not be one in which teacher and investigator cooperate in friendly fashion. All that the investigator can tell the teacher about the system of language, and how to exploit it in presentation, will benefit the classroom. All that the teacher can tell the investigator about students' responses, failures, and successes will benefit the investigation of how language works.

ARCHIBALD A. HILL

The University of Texas

Foreign Language Teaching in Europe

IN CONSIDERING foreign language instruction in Europe several things must be kept in mind. In the first place, the school system and the public attitude toward education are very unlike American attitudes and our own school organization. In most countries children enter a secondary school somewhere between ten and thirteen years of age on the basis of examination. A secondary school means one which offers an academic course, prepares the child for entrance to a university or professional school after five to nine years, and confers upon him a certificate at the completion of his course. The term does not include the many types of vocational or trade schools that train young people after they leave the elementary school, and the discussion below is limited to the elementary school and the secondary school. The extent to which foreign language instruction is offered in the post-primary and non-secondary schools and the methods employed need to be explored at greater length.

The number of children who attend a secondary school is as low as 5% in some areas, while in others it is nearly 50%. In all the countries, far more start such a school than complete it, so that statistics showing the numbers who hold the certificate are not indicative of the number that receive some academic training beyond the elementary school. It is generally true, however, that the great majority of young people in Europe either cease their education at the completion of elementary school or attend some type of vocational school.

Another important consideration is that in Europe a child has little or no choice of subject matter. At the time he enters the secondary school, he may decide, with the help and advice of teachers and parents, to pursue a classical course, a modern language course, or a science-mathematics program, and his selection will often determine which school he must attend. Sometimes this decision may be deferred until the third or fourth year of the elementary school, particularly in large institutions which

offer more than one program. But within the course itself, whether classical, modern, or scientific, he has almost no choice of subject matter, and must study whatever is deemed necessary for his education in the estimate of school authorities. Such a thing as our system of a few required courses combined with electives is unheard of in all European systems of education that we observed.

In general, foreign language instruction is deferred until the child enters secondary school. There are two main reasons for this. First, it would be very difficult to find enough qualified teachers to give foreign language instruction at the elementary level. Europeans are on the whole rather exacting as to the quality of such instruction, and merely the fact that one has studied a foreign language for a few years at the secondary level is not ordinarily considered sufficient preparation for teaching it. Second, they realize that for foreign language study to be of great value it must be pursued assiduously over a period of years. Since many children do not continue their schooling beyond the primary years, it appears to them an economic waste to offer language instruction to the many who will drop out after only a year or so of such study. The exceptions to this general practice will be noted below.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. *Is foreign language instruction offered in the elementary school?*

Not at all: In Denmark, France, Holland, and Switzerland.

To some extent: In England, Germany, Luxembourg, Norway, and Sweden.

A. England: Language instruction is not generally offered in the public elementary schools, but there are one or two experiments going on in English towns that have paired themselves with French towns and engage in a great many exchange visits. For example, in the town of Harrogate, French is taught in the primary school. On the other hand, in the pri-

vate preparatory schools, French is quite commonly begun with children at age eight and continued through their school years.

B. *Germany*: Students doing well in all other subjects are allowed to enter foreign language classes in the fifth year of the elementary school. In Berlin all students begin the study of a foreign language in the fifth year regardless of their standing in other subjects.

C. *Norway*: English is begun in the sixth school year for all pupils, except in some rural areas where a teacher is not available.

D. *Sweden*: English is offered in the fifth school year, when the child is eleven, but not all pupils are allowed to take it.

E. *Luxembourg*: This little country is unique among the European nations for which we obtained information in that foreign language study is begun in the first year of the primary school and continued for as long as the child remains in any type of school. The program will be described in detail later.

2. Which is the first foreign language usually studied by the child? The second? The third?

	1	2	3
Denmark	English—90% German—10%	German	French
England	French	German	
France	English or German	German or English	Italian or Spanish
Germany (western)	English—95% French—5%*	French	
Holland	English and French	English	German
Luxembourg	German	French	English
Norway	English	German	French
Sweden	English	German	French
Switzerland	French or German†	English or Italian	Italian or English

* In Germany an effort is being made to get all schools to adopt English as the first foreign language taught, but along the French border a number of schools still offer French as the first.

† In French-speaking Switzerland, German is the first foreign language offered, while in German-speaking Switzerland, French is the first. In the small Italian-speaking area, French is usually first, German second.

3. How long is the study of the first, second, and third foreign language continued?

	1	2	3
Denmark	7 years	6 years	4 years
England	5 years	2-3 years*	

France	6-7 years	3-4 years	
Germany	8-9 years	3 years	
Luxembourg	To end of program	To end of program	3-6 years
Holland	5-6 years†	5-6 years	4-5 years
Norway	3-5 years	2-3 years	3 years
Sweden	8 years	4-6 years	2 years
Switzerland	8 years	5-6 years	5-6 years

* In England it is rather unusual for a child to have more than one modern foreign language. It is more common in the Army Dependents' schools, and a description of such a program is included below.

† In Holland, both French and English are started simultaneously and continued throughout secondary school.

4. How often does the foreign language class meet each week?

The number of weekly hours of foreign language instruction in all the countries varies from year to year and according to the type of school the child attends and the course he pursues within that school. Most beginning courses meet five or six times a week for a forty or forty-five minute period; in later years the child may attend his foreign language class four or five times a week if he is in a classical or modern language section, but if he is in a science section, it may be as little as twice weekly. The important thing is that *at least one foreign language is required every year in every type of course in all European secondary schools.*

5. What aspect of language is emphasized in the foreign language classes?

- A. Spoken language: Denmark, France, Germany, Holland, Luxembourg, Norway.
- B. Reading and translation: Sweden, England.
- C. Total culture: Switzerland.

In general, teachers of English tend to emphasize the spoken language, but teachers of French and German tend to put more stress on grammar and translation, except in Holland where all teachers seem to be most concerned with the spoken language. There are, of course, individual differences in all countries, so that the above groupings are only general. In the elementary schools language programs are more inclined to emphasize the spoken language. When, in the secondary schools, reading and

translation are stressed, one reason is that the students are expected to take state examinations, which require this type of knowledge.

6. *How much use is made of audio-visual aids?*

In some of the smaller countries many schools have tape-recorders, but the schools of France and Germany still generally lack funds and facilities for such equipment. In general, not much use is made of audio-visual aids within the school language courses. In Norway and Sweden, the American and British Embassies supply many excellent educational films, some of them in English, and the teacher has an opportunity to prepare his class in advance for these films, thereby increasing their value. In almost every country the commercial theaters frequently show films in a language foreign to the country, with American-made pictures being extremely popular. It is entirely up to the individual teacher how much use he makes of these opportunities or of any audio-visual aids the school may possess.

7. A. *Does the foreign language teacher teach other subjects?*

Elementary school language teachers:
Yes, usually.

Secondary school language teachers:
No, in Denmark, England, Germany, Holland, Sweden. Yes, in Luxembourg, Norway. France, no, in Paris; yes, in the smaller towns and country districts. Switzerland, no, in the upper sections; yes, in the lower years.

B. *Does he teach more than one foreign language?*

All countries: Yes, very often.

C. *Is study or residence abroad part of the requirement to teach a foreign language?*

England, Holland, Luxembourg, Switzerland: yes. Denmark, no, but few have not been in the country of the language they teach. The Danish Ministry of Education now offers to pay part of a teacher's expenses when he enrolls for a course in a country whose language he teaches. France, Germany, Norway, Sweden, no, but it is customary.

8. *What is the public attitude toward foreign language study?*

Holland, Denmark, Luxembourg, Switzerland: The more time spent on language study the better. France, Germany, Norway, Sweden: A knowledge of at least one foreign language is essential to the child's education. There is no question about the amount of time devoted to that end. England: To date, foreign language study is an auxiliary rather than an essential part of the child's education. Many teachers deplore the fact that not more time is given it.

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

A. As mentioned above, the foreign language program in Luxembourg needs to be described in detail. The first language is German, begun in the first grade, which the child enters at age six. While the child's native Luxembourg dialect is closely related to German, it is still different enough so that high German must be regarded as a foreign language. He learns it by means of the direct method, his own dialect being used only for explanations of difficult German words or constructions. In the spring of the second school year, French is begun. In the first year German is studied seven or eight times a week, and after that four or five times. Beginning with the third year, French is maintained at eight lessons a week through the elementary school. It must be remarked, however, that arithmetic, geography, history, and the natural sciences in the upper years of the eight-year elementary school are taught in German, and the teacher is urged to explain sometimes a matter in French that has already been learned in German. Every teacher is, therefore, either directly or indirectly, a language teacher.

The secondary school begins at age twelve, and French and German, in that order, are now the languages of instruction. The formal study of French begins with six lessons a week, and is reduced to five in the upper classes of the seven-year classical or six-year modern course. German instruction begins with three lessons and ends with two lessons a week. In addition, French is used for all instruction in arithmetic and geography, while German is used for all other subjects (explanations of English texts,

the grammar of Latin and Greek, history, religion, natural sciences) in the lower forms. In the upper classes, French is used for all subjects except for the grammatical explanations of Greek and Latin. Thus a child in the classical school in his first year would have ten lessons taught in French and nineteen in German each week, but in the fourth year he would have sixteen in French and fifteen in German, and in his last year twenty-nine in French and only three in German. In addition the child gets one lesson a week in his native dialect throughout his school years, and English is a very popular subject in the modern schools from the first year on (six years altogether), and even in the classical schools beginning in the third year.

B. In the Scandinavian countries, in addition to the regular foreign language courses of English, German, and French, children are expected to have a knowledge of the three Scandinavian tongues (Norse, Swedish, and Danish), and they must pass examinations in these languages and read the literature of all three, even though they may not study them formally. Also in these countries, and in Holland as well, students entering a university are expected to be able to read texts in English, French, and German, and often to attend lectures in one of these languages.

C. A special problem exists in Germany and Sweden, where the child may enter the secondary school at the end of the fourth year or two years later. Those who remain in the elementary school the extra two years may receive an inferior quality of language instruction, as the requirements for teachers at that level are not as high as for the secondary school. Then when he enters a class that has already had two years of instruction from a highly competent teacher in the secondary school, he is at a serious disadvantage. This is one reason why many of the countries prefer to give no foreign language training until the secondary school, or have only one entrance age.

D. As might be expected, in the Army Dependents' schools established in Germany by England, the first foreign language offered is German, but since many of the children in these schools will finish or at least attend a secondary school in their homeland, French is studied as well by those who are enrolled in the grammar

sections. We visited one of these schools located in Ploen, and found that an unusual situation existed. Although for some of the children this was their first experience with the German language, a large number of them had spoken German as their native language and some had lived all their lives in Germany. They could of course converse readily in the language and had no difficulty in understanding the instruction of the foreign language class, given entirely in German. On the other hand, some of them had great difficulty in learning to read and write it, and they often experienced a similar difficulty with English. Part of this arose from the fact that these children seldom remained in one school for more than two years, and some had attended as many as thirteen schools in the space of six years. Consequently they had had stretches of no school attendance when they fell behind their classmates, and they had been subjected to a variety of teachers, some of whom had stressed grammar, others reading, and still others the spoken language. While the child's school achievement was frequently less than that of a child with more regular school attendance, his ability to speak German, or a dialect of it, was often considerably advanced, for he had the opportunity of practicing it at home either with one of his parents, with domestics, or with other children in the community.

SUMMARY

The attitudes of the vast majority of Europeans toward foreign language study are:

1. No one can be considered educated who does not have a working knowledge of at least one foreign language, and many feel it necessary to acquire a fluency in two or three.

2. It takes many years to learn a foreign language, so that instruction must be started by the time a child is twelve and continued for not less than five years, and preferably seven or eight.

3. The teacher should be a specialist, having majored in the language at the university, after having learned it in secondary school. He should also spend six months to a year in the country where the language is spoken, if at all possible. The quality of teacher is exceedingly important and cannot be compensated for by possession of mechanical equipment.

The countries which have achieved the greatest success with their programs of foreign language instruction are those small nations which either have no single national language or whose own language is not widely spoken by other peoples.

Factors which bear most on a successful program are: length of time a language is studied, skill and knowledge of the teacher, methods employed, and public attitude toward the necessity of foreign language knowledge.

* * *

We wish to express our gratitude to the Fulbright Commission in Germany for making it financially possible for us to make a study of foreign language instruction in the countries included in this report, and also to the several Fulbright Commissions in these countries for

making contacts for us with school authorities and in many cases arranging visits to the schools. We also wish to thank the Embassies, Information Centers, and Ministries of Education in the various countries for either supplying information or checking the above material for accuracy.

We could not, in this paper, include all the information we gathered, and we feel that at best this should be considered a preliminary report and the subject ought to be pursued further. We hope that we may some day return and make a more exhaustive study of the procedures used in Europe and the results achieved (including many more nations, and country districts as well as cultural centers).

ERNEST E. ELLERT
LOIS V. ELLERT

Hope College

* * *

Phonetics and phonology would not be a science and could never take up a historical point of view, or rise to historical concepts, if there were no poetic urge in language to bring our deepest feelings, meanings, and thoughts to the surface in the form of sounds. The less poetic a language is, the less material there is for phoneticians, and vice versa. Its phonetic body is equivalent to its poetic capacity. Voiceless and shadowy languages, like the system of mathematical symbols or the codes of telegraphy, or languages that exist only in writing or in schools, like Middle Latin or Esperanto, are poor soil for the philologist or the philological historian.

—KARL VOSSLER

* * *

Yes, words long faded may again revive;
And words may fade now blooming and alive,
If usage wills it so, to whom belongs
The rule and law, the government of tongues.

—HORACE

* * *

The Story of a Stamp: A Lesson in Interculture

USERS of postage-stamps—that includes most of us—are aware of a recent issue of a three-cent stamp bearing a picture of the Statue of Liberty, a symbolic figure known the world over as the outstanding feature of New York Harbor. In different colors, the same picture appears also on a new issue of an eight-cent stamp. This picture on our postage-stamps is peculiarly appropriate but, familiar as this image is, it may well be doubted whether very many Americans fully realize its profound significance as a symbol of important elements in our present-day civilization.

As most students of history are aware, France was the first country to recognize the United States officially as an independent nation. The Statue of Liberty was a gift from France to the United States, in commemoration of the centenary of our Declaration of Independence in 1776. This was no mere gesture of a government. It depended on the personal, warm-hearted friendship of thousands of French children throughout France, for the money to pay for the statue was principally raised by voluntary contributions of boys and girls in the schools throughout our sister republic.

The creator of the statue, Frédéric Auguste Bartholdi, had need of a special workshop to accomplish his colossal task. It was designed for him by Alexandre Eiffel, the same engineering genius who later built for the Paris Exposition of 1889 the great tower which bears his name. The Eiffel Tower, a practical demonstration of the building uses of structural steel, was the ancestor of our modern skyscrapers. It has come to be almost a symbol of Paris. So the two famous monuments which symbolize Paris and New York have close connections from their very beginnings.

The original title of Bartholdi's statue was "Liberty Enlightening the World." In more than one sense, the high point of the allegoric figure is the torch which she holds. The hand holding the torch was the first part of the statue to be completed and to be shipped across

the ocean. The index finger alone is eight feet long; the right arm is forty-two feet in length and twelve feet thick. It remains the unparalleled example of "hands across the sea."

With obvious appropriateness, the most conspicuous word on our current three-cent stamp is the word LIBERTY extending across the bottom. Centuries ago it came into use in English as an easy anglicization of the French word *liberté*. Thus it stands as a representative of the language which has contributed far more to the making of modern English than has any other aside from Anglo-Saxon.

This recent postage-stamp issue is not the first to bear an image of the Statue of Liberty. In fact, the *one-cent* stamp which was used during the time of the second World War is in some ways more interesting because its symbolism was more comprehensive. Instead of showing only the upper part of the statue, as on the present issue, it gave a complete picture including the base, though necessarily on a smaller scale. Moreover, all the words were spelled out in full: "UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . . . INDUSTRY . . . AGRICULTURE . . . FOR DEFENSE . . . POSTAGE 1 CENT."

Of the ten words (aside from the figure "1") which appeared on that stamp, no less than six came into English from French: *states, industry, agriculture, defense, postage, and cent*. Every one of these six words is eloquent concerning the development of modern civilization. They are fairly representative of the French contribution without which our American life could not have become what it is.

As samples to represent the far-reaching connections suggested by these words, we may briefly consider the last three: *defense, postage, and cent*.

Defense—a corruption of which appears in our common word *fence*, with all of its meanings, even in slang—may remind us of the fact that practically our entire vocabulary of military terms is of French origin. To mention only

a few items, recall, for example, *infantry*, *cavalry*, and *artillery*, or notice *corporal* (originally *caporal*), *sergeant*, *lieutenant*, *captain*, *colonel*, and *general*. There are *squad*, *company*, *battalion*, *regiment*, *division*, *corps*, and *army*. It is to French also that we owe the words, *balloon*, *parachute*, *aéroplane*, *aéronaut*, *hangar*, *fuselage*, "ace," and so on. The very word *air* came into English from French!

The word *postage* is representative of French influence in a peculiar and important way. Actually it appears to have been compounded in English, but the manner of its formation, thoroughly typical as it is, shows how deeply the French *system* has become a part of our everyday language. In all its meanings and uses, the word *post* comes to English from French. Long before the making of "postage," however, most of the more common French endings employed to show relationships of ideas had permeated the very foundations of English speech. That is why, when we make up a new word nowadays, we are almost certain to give it a characteristically French termination, such for instance as -age, -ment, -tion, -ation, -ance, -ic (-ique), -eer(-ier), -ess, -ine, -ity, -ard, -al, -ee, -et, -ette, -let, -ery, -ism, -ive, -able, -ous, or -ure. Dyed-in-the-wool classicists may prefer to think of some of these endings as "Latin" or "Greek," but the simple truth is that they became an integral part of our tongue because so many French words with similar endings had been adopted that they came to seem the natural way for us to handle those classes of words.

The word *cent*, which came into English from Old French, suggests other realms of thought. The decimal system of currency, now used by almost every country in the world except England, goes along with the metric system which was introduced by France early in the eighteenth century. Indeed, the whole idea of standard measurement is essentially a French contribution to our modern life.

Of the other four words on the stamp which we are considering, two are commonly called "Latin." The name of our country has made the word *united* seem very familiar to us now, but before the American Revolution the verb *unite* must have seemed a somewhat scholarly word in comparison with common, everyday

speech. Our word *unity*, however, of which "unit" is merely a mutilated form, came from French *unilé*. And the name *America*—synthetic "Latin" of the sort which was fashionable during the Renaissance—appears to have been first proposed in 1507 by a teacher of geography in the college of Saint-Dié, in France.

Of all the ten words on the stamp, only two are of Anglo-Saxon origin, the prepositions *of* and *for*. These are typical of a large part of the Anglo-Saxon element in our language. Aside from common terms to express simple, primitive, and usually rather vague ideas, it tends to be a matter of connectives such as these. Yet even here the mark of French influence is distinctly visible. To be sure, the word *of* is "pure" Anglo-Saxon, one of the few words from that source which we still use without any change of *form* in over a thousand years. But the point is that its *use* has been completely altered. Instead of meaning *from*, as it did in Anglo-Saxon, it has come to be an equivalent of the French preposition *de*, in the genitive or possessive case. In the phrase "of America" it is used as the Anglo-Saxons would not have used it. What the French language has contributed to English is not only vast riches of vocabulary, but also considerable flexibility of idiom, new patterns of thought-symbols which were unknown in the more primitive tongue.

The figure "1," as *printed*, would hardly be called a "word," but of course it becomes such when we read it aloud. Though only a slight detail, this starting-point of our numerical system again suggests indirectly a phenomenon somewhat similar to what we have seen in *of*. For even in so elemental a thing as our manner of counting, there appears evidence of the combination of Anglo-Saxon and French in modern English. While the Anglo-Saxon words continue in use, we have long been accustomed to putting them together according to the French plan. The Germanic idiom of "four and twenty," for instance, is replaced by *twenty-four*, like the French *vingt-quatre*, and the same method applies to our whole system. For the large numbers which we have more and more occasion to employ (for better or worse) these days, the French words *million* and *billion* have become quite universal.

We should be considering the matter very

superficially if we supposed that a postage-stamp has to be dependent upon the words printed on it in order to be emblematical of the connections between France and America. Let us think for a moment of stamps in their actual postal function. Like everything else, they have evolved out of a historical background. A pamphlet of information issued by the Post Office Department in 1938 carries this interesting statement: "It is a generally-accepted fact that the first real postal system was established in France in 1450 under Louis XI. He employed regular postal messengers, each of whom announced his approach with blasts from a golden horn, and this system was later adopted throughout most of Europe . . ." Not until two hundred years later was there apparently any thought of "stamps," but these too, when they finally came, were likewise a French invention. The first record of any use of stamps for postal purposes was in Paris in 1653.

Perhaps it is not irrelevant to notice in passing that the *envelope*, on which a stamp is placed, is also a French invention. Its name, coming into English in comparatively modern times, continued to be pronounced more or less as in French, whereas the verb *envelop*, which had entered our language much earlier, had

become completely anglicized in pronunciation.

There are special reasons why that *one-cent* stamp in use a few years ago might seem a particularly appropriate vehicle for the image of the Statue of Liberty, and might bring to mind various things in Franco-American relations. Beginning with the first issue of that denomination in 1851, aside from special commemorative issues from time to time, our one-cent stamp traditionally bore the portrait of our first Postmaster General, Benjamin Franklin. No man in all history could more fittingly represent the friendship between America and France. He it was who negotiated and signed our treaty of alliance with that nation which helped so vitally in winning the War of Independence. It was during his long sojourn at Paris that he wrote his celebrated *Autobiography*, and it was first published in French!

So, in these small pieces of gummed paper which we are accustomed to take for granted as a matter of course, there are reminders of long chapters of history which we should do well not to forget.

LOUIS FOLEY

*Babson Institute
Wellesley, Massachusetts*

* * *

NOTICE TO OUR READERS

If your subscription expired with the issue of May, 1956, please send your renewal NOW to the Business Manager, Mr. Stephen L. Pitcher, 7144 Washington Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri, or to the treasurer of your local member association, in order to insure continued delivery of your copies of the *Journal*. If you are *not* a subscriber, you are cordially invited to become one by sending \$4.00, the annual subscription rate of the *Modern Language Journal*, to the Business Manager.

* * *

Notes and News

"American" versus "Native" Language Instructors

Any discussion on the relative merits of American-born versus foreign-born language instructors must by virtue of the very nature of the subject be highly controversial. However, this article is not intended to present its contents as a "problem" but rather as a stimulating topic that might aid us to improve our teaching efficiency by pointing out some of our own weaknesses.

There remains little doubt that the relative effectiveness of American-born and foreign-born (native) modern language instructors can only be evaluated on the basis of statistical data obtained through scientific methods. It is perhaps the scarcity of data and controversial nature of the subject that accounts for the fact that there is hardly any specific study or investigation available that would permit us to delve into the question with conclusive results.

Yet, over the years several authors that have contributed to the *Modern Language Journal* have on occasions voiced their opinion, if only as a side-observation to their actual topic on which they wrote. Their respected opinions may help us here to throw some light on our own discussion.

The following is a list of quotations taken from the *MLJ* 1953/54:

April 1953. Albert D. Menut, "Intensive Language Courses: Content and Techniques."

"These English-Russian exercises should be so presented that they serve to emphasize the difference between merely literal translation and genuinely idiomatic equivalence. Such instruction demands that the teacher be as nearly bilingual as possible, since it requires a thorough idiomatic command of both Russian and English and almost equal *Sprachgefühl* for each. However, the native Russian instructor whose English is wholly insufficient to permit him to handle the translation class may very well do a very superior job in the dialogue hour. In fact, it is amazing to observe the facility with which some teachers solve the problem of communicating ideas to students whose language is almost totally unknown to them."

May 1953. Henry Grattan Doyle, "Modern Foreign Languages in American Education."

"We must protect the properly-trained American teacher of foreign languages against the somewhat widespread belief that any "native" can teach his own language to American boys or girls, and we must protect the efficient "native" teacher who can teach from the competition of his fellows who have merely drifted into such teaching—the all-too-common itinerant "foreign language professor" for whom school administrators—and some parents—have such a superstitious regard."

April 1954. Nicholas Hobbs, "Foreign Languages in the Elementary Schools."

"We have all known colleagues on university campuses who speak with strong German or French accents and make good sense when they talk, and making sense is doubtlessly our most fundamental objective in language instruction."

December 1954. John Van Eerde, "Language Teaching in the Soviet Union."

"If circumstances some day bring about a general shift in emphasis to the oral method, pronunciation must suffer. Too many generations will have passed on the peculiarities of certain Russian sounds without the corrective influence of native teachers."

So far the quotations are from competent language instructors to which the writer may be permitted to add his own opinion and view-points:

At the beginning it should be stressed again that a comparison of the two types of instructors does not imply criticism on the efficient teaching methods employed by the qualified and well-trained language instructor, foreign-born or American-born. However, attention is invited to the "weak spots" of either type that would leave room for improvement, shall our language program here in the States maintain its high standard of performance and achievement.

Students in language classes often ask how they can be expected to acquire a second language when their own 'native' instructor "murders the King's English." But to offset this somewhat negative remark we frequently encounter students saying "Madame N. certainly makes us SPEAK French, while Miss C. always bothers us with those English translations."

It appears obvious that both types of instructors have their strong as well as their weak sides. The native teacher usually is found superior when it comes to the conversational approach, while the American-born instructor may establish better lines of communication with the student group in translation exercises where a good command of the English language is required. But however the situation may be, we need both types of instructors to carry on our tradition of modern language instruction in American schools.

Undoubtedly, the native teacher is a welcome contribution to "rejuvenate" out-dated and antique language practices (especially pronunciation) and provide us with a new influx and fresh atmosphere of foreign cultures and particularities we intend to teach our students.

How a language can easily lose its pureness can often be noticed in foreign language newspapers published in the States. There we find sometimes a bad garble of English and foreign language terms that may result in advertisements such as "Habt ein würdiges Funeral, sehr preiswert! Jedes Funeral ein Tribut!"

May our efforts to improve our teaching methods not result in a funeral of foreign languages whose highest standards we endeavor to teach: "Beauty of sound, and correctness of the written word."

RUDOLPH F. WAGNER

Former Training Consultant
Stuttgart Military Post
Germany

A Descriptive Approach to Adjective Inflection

All too often the matter of adjective endings is a hurdle which tends beyond all reason to embarrass and inhibit beginning and even advanced students of German, particularly in view of the modern emphasis on oral competence. So formidable does the task appear to the student that he has frequently been known to say, "Do the Germans really use these endings in ordinary conversation?" The attitude is understandable. To arrive at a given ending, the student is ordinarily taught to interrupt the flow or rhythm of discourse, determine whether the adjective is "limiting" or "descriptive," whether it does or does not follow a "der-word" or "ein-word," whether the latter has or has not a "strong" ending, what case, number, and gender the following noun has, and then consult a mental chart as to the ending that applies under the given constellation of conditions. Is all this confusing apparatus of "strong," "weak," and "mixed" endings really necessary? Must one involve three charts totalling 48 places in order to account for the distribution of five possible endings?

A very radical simplification becomes possible if we discard the historical approach altogether and invent the shortest possible, purely descriptive explanation which

will satisfy the data. At the same time we reduce the complex skill to a series of independent, simple stimulus-response reactions which can be habituated one by one and are practically devoid of any theoretical detours. The following chart which this writer distributes to his beginning classes is here presented as a methodological suggestion in this direction.

The chart is for the most part self-explanatory. It assumes a mastery of the article declension. It purposely avoids any such terminology as "strong" or "weak," since these terms are no longer helpful from a strictly descriptive point of view. The rule as to the strong adjective (II a) disregards the genitive singular masculine and neuter invasion by the weak ending (*stehenden Fusses*, etc.), but this slight loss of accuracy seems amply compensated for by the simplicity of the explanation, which reduces the entire problem to an extension of the article declension. The endings to be filled in under (II b) are derived by the students from an inspection of complete paradigms written on the blackboard by the teacher in advance of the period. The psychological advantage is apparent that one ending is made to "trigger off" another in a life-like manner without

ADJECTIVE ENDINGS, SIMPLIFIED CHART

I. Basic Rule: All adjectives used before nouns (never after) take on endings to agree with the nouns they modify as to *gender, number, and case*.

II. The ending to be used is affected not only by the following noun but by the *sentence position of the adjective*, as follows:

a. If the adjective is *not* preceded by a der-word or ein-word, it takes the endings of *der*.¹

Examples: Ich trinke *den* Kaffee. Therefore:

Ich trinke heißen Kaffee.

Bei *dem* Wetter bleibe ich im Hause. Therefore:

Bei schlechtem Wetter bleibe ich im Hause.

Das Land ist gut für den Bauern. Therefore:

Flaches Land ist gut für den Bauern. (note modification)

b. If on the contrary the adjective *is* preceded by a der-word or an ein-word, the following chart applies (in part to be filled in by the student):

Adj. preceded by:	takes ending:		also applies to adj. preceded by:
<i>der</i>	(e) if nominative 2 (en) otherwise 3		any der-word or ein-word ending in -er
<i>des</i>	(en) 4		any der-word or ein-word ending in -es in genitive sense
<i>dem</i>	(en) 5		any der-word or ein-word ending in -em
<i>den</i>	(en) 6		any der-word or ein-word ending in -en
<i>die</i>	(e) if singular 7 (en) if plural 8		any der-word or ein-word ending in -e
<i>das</i>	(e) 9		any der-word or ein-word ending in -es in other than genitive sense
<i>ein</i>	(er) if masculine 10 (es) if neuter 11		any ein-word with no inflectional ending

reflection, so that *den armen Mann* and *den armen Männern*, for example, are only one psychological operation, not two. The numbers 1-11 appearing on the chart are used in drill exercises. A mimeographed sheet is distributed on which every declined adjective is followed by a dash, in which the student fills in the number of the appropriate rule. Additional drill material (fill-ins, translation) can be taken from traditional sources or readily improvised. Oral

drill material for the sound laboratory can easily be devised; for example, the students may fill in endings on a mimeographed sheet on the basis of a parallel sound tape.

The chart may also be introduced in reviewing adjective declension, when it is desired to approach the subject from a fresh angle.

JOHN WINKELMAN

University of Nebraska

Foreign Languages and Scientific Research

Foreign language requirements are advocated and defended chiefly on the grounds of usefulness. This is especially true with regard to the sciences. Science students are told that to succeed in their professions they must be able to read foreign language journals. Until very recently, science majors could be, and perhaps were, regarded as a captive audience. There was no need to lure them into the study of, say, German. A chemist or physiologist *has* to read German—like it or not.

There are now some signs that this captive audience may disappear. For some time it has seemed increasingly clear that the younger scientists are not using foreign language journals in their research. This impression—there was no real proof—has now received startling and depressing confirmation in a recent study of medical and biochemical journals conducted at West Virginia University.

West Virginia University is now in the process of building a new medical and dental school. One of the major problems involved is the provision of an adequate medical library. As is generally the case in the sciences, journals will comprise the bulk of the collection. The relatively limited funds available to provide the basic collection—about \$80,000—has necessitated a most careful selection of titles. The most-used journals must be provided first; lesser-used titles will be added as funds permit.

The most accurate and impartial method of discovering the journals most-used in medical research seemed to be a citation analysis of key medical journals. The history, methodology and results of citation analyses have been described elsewhere and need not be repeated here.¹ Suffice it to say, that all such studies are based on the premise that, in general, citation means use.

For the purposes of this study, seven key medical journals were selected.² All are leading publications in their fields; four are official publications of national professional societies. The 1954 issues of all the publications were used. It was decided that no less than 1000 citations from any one journal would be considered an adequate sample (the actual numbers range from 1065 to 4292). The total number of citations was 13,327.

Perhaps the most startling finding was the small use made of non-English language scientific journals. Seventy-six journals (out of a total of over 1200) accounted for as much as one percent of the total number of citations. Only five of these high-use journals were foreign language (three German, two French). In several fields no foreign language journal accounted for as much as one percent of the total number of citations. In no case did a foreign language title number among the first five most frequently cited.

These figures are startling enough as they stand. They become considerably more so when they are compared with the results of similar studies made before World War II. For example:

A citation analysis of the "American Journal of Physiology" for 1938/39 revealed that four of the fifteen most frequently cited journals were non-English (three German, one French).³ In 1954 *none* of the first fifteen were foreign language.

In the much broader field of biochemistry we find an even sharper drop in the use of foreign language journals. A citation analysis of the "Annual Review of Biochemistry" for the period 1932-36 showed that ten of the twenty most frequently cited titles were non-English language (seven German, three French).⁴ In 1954 *none* of the first twenty were foreign language.

The same trend prevails in the field of general chemistry. A citation analysis of the "Journal of the American Chemical Society" indicates a steady decline in the use of foreign language titles by American chemists. This decline is illustrated in the following table. The figures for 1899-1939 are taken from Fussler.⁵

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SERIAL REFERENCES FROM THE "JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY" BY LANGUAGE

	1899	1919	1939	1954
English	37.7	48.1	64.5	80.59
German	49.1	40.5	25.0	12.47
French	9.9	7.8	3.0	4.33
Other and undetermined	3.3	3.6	7.5	2.61
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

¹ Rolland E. Stevens. "Characteristics of Subject Literature." *ACRL Monograph No. 6*, 1953.

² *American Journal of Anatomy; American Journal of Pathology, American Journal of Physiology, American Journal of Surgery, American Medical Association Journal, Journal of Bacteriology, Annual Review of Biochemistry.*

³ Estelle Brodman. Methods of choosing psychology journals. Master's essay, School of Library Service, Columbia University, Oct. 1943.

⁴ H. H. Henkle. "Periodical Literature in Biochemistry." *Bulletin Medical Library Association*, 27: 139-47, 1939.

⁵ Herman Fussler. "Characteristics of the research literature used by Chemists and Physicists in the United States." *Library Quarterly* 19: 2 Apr 1949, pl 28.

The almost spectacular decline in the use foreign language sources in medical and chemical research is, alas, a matter of fact. Many scientists claim that this decline is quite proper; that it simply reflects the decline in the value of foreign scientific work. However, most of us who have worked at reference desks of university libraries would insist on the importance of another factor: the inability of many young scientists to read (not decipher) foreign languages. Since deciphering is so tedious, these scientists do not read foreign language journals. Thus do they confirm the comfortable belief that foreign science is unworthy of their attention.

This attitude based on ignorance has many ramifications. All are unfortunate. Perhaps the most serious is the tendency of these scientists to depreciate the importance of foreign languages to their students. Being all too human, they are unlikely to stress the importance of skills they do not themselves possess. This new scientific provincialism presents dangers far greater than a decline in modern language enrollments. Sooner or later it will surely endanger the scientific supremacy on which our safety rests.

ROBERT F. MUNN

*Assistant Librarian
West Virginia University*

A Defense of Grammar

In my thirty-odd years of teaching modern languages in both high school and college it has seemed to me that there has been an ever-growing tendency to avoid grammar or at least to avoid the term "grammar". Many language teachers appear to have the feeling that there is something opprobrious in the term even though they recognize the need for grammar. Perhaps this aversion for calling the rules governing the structure of a language by its correct name of grammar springs from a desire to avoid formality, to make our courses more friendly and thus make our subject more palatable.

All serious-minded language teachers (and I believe virtually all of us are of this type) want to impart as much of our subject to students as is possible in the all too brief time allotted to us. Is it not incumbent on us then to use any and every device available for this end? At the risk of being dubbed a complete reactionary, I submit that we are missing a useful and time-proven device if we do not frankly and openly teach grammar and call it such. After all, what is grammar? The definition in Webster which seems to apply most clearly to our task as language teachers is "the art concerned with the right use and application of the rules of a language in speaking or writing." In other words, grammar outlines the rules of the game. It is just as essential to learn these rules and their application to the language we are studying as it is to learn the mechanics of operating a car and the laws which govern its use on the streets and highways.

The obvious advantages of grammar as a short-cut must be pointed out to the student. For example, it must be clearly brought to his attention that having learned one regular French verb in *-er* he has established a pattern for all the regular verbs of this large conjugation. If we bring this fact home clearly to the student's mind we are certainly justified in requiring him to learn the verb thoroughly and to demand that he prove that he has learned it by giving it in writing.

No opportunity should be neglected to apply the rules which are learned. For example after we have studied the subjunctive in our grammar text its usage must be pointed out as soon as it occurs in what we read. It may seem repetitious and tiresome to us to emphasize the same point again and again but we must not lose sight of the fact that this

is not *old* stuff to our students. They are covering the route for the first time and they need every possible sign post and guide board.

Our goal is to learn to use the language either actively in speaking and writing, or passively in reading. No matter what our objective is we need grammar as a torch in the darkness. How, for example, can we get the real understanding of one of De Maupassant's stories if we do not know what shade of meaning he had in mind by his use of the three common past tenses, the past indefinite, the imperfect and the past definite? Or if we are trying to speak or write, how can we show single action or progression in the past if we do not understand the function of the past indefinite and the imperfect?

The reciting of rules in the exact words of the text is of dubious value unless the rules are applied clearly to the language itself. We may manage to force a student to learn that the past participle of a verb conjugated with "avoir" agrees with the preceding direct object but the rule is of little value unless he can and will apply it.

We have learned the grammar of our own language largely by absorption. If we have heard correct English, we speak correct English. Like the character in the old play who had spoken prose all his life without knowing it, we all use grammar whenever we speak, write, or read whether we are aware of it or not.

The situation that we are faced with in class-room instruction in foreign languages is very different from the natural situation in which our students have learned their mother tongue. From the time they were born they have heard the native speech. They hear it and read it and write it throughout grade school. When they attack a foreign language their points of access are sharply restricted. The teacher is virtually the students' only contact with the foreign idiom. As teachers we must give as much of the subject as we can. Certainly we should be remiss in our duty if we did not take advantage of the well-classified knowledge that deals with the right use and application of the rules of a language, in other words "grammar."

Grammar is not an end in itself; it is but the means to an end*but it is a means which should be used freely and without apology just as we use a foot-log to cross a stream even though we might conceivably wade through it. The

foot-log on which we crossed the stream is a humble affair but it is a valuable means to an end. It deserves to be called by its right name. It should be given credit for its usefulness. Likewise, grammar deserves to be called by its right

name and to be taught and used for what it is, a classified short-cut to the complex structure of a language.

O. L. ABBOTT

Michigan State University

Do-It-Yourself Aural and Oral Evaluation

The problem of assigning a grade to a student by measuring his achievement in reading is quite easily dealt with nowadays. We have standard tests for that purpose. We can readily devise sets of examination questions to test the ability to write the foreign language with grammatical correctness, tests which will be comparable from one set to the other. There even exist composition scales for free writing. The two operations which still need to be tested by some device other than the subjective guess of the instructor are the ability to comprehend the foreign tongue when it is spoken and the ability to produce the foreign tongue with some degree of ease and accuracy. The single adjunct of a tape recorder can change this situation for the better almost overnight.

To check the aural comprehension of members of a class it has been feasible to play phonograph records containing simple anecdotes or other material and put questions on the content to the class. With the coming of the tape recorder the problem of getting a variety of materials and of securing enough properly graded texts is at once simplified and complicated. For the wealth of texts from which to assemble a battery of graded oral readings for testing can now be put to use. At the same time the instructor who is not a native speaker himself may well prefer to use someone from the homeland of the language, and not every campus has a qualified native speaker whose voice meets requirements. Some larger universities, however, will sometimes fill a tape by request for a small fee. A check with students who have undergone testing and a conscientious recheck of their scores will indicate whether the texts have been accurately graded or not.

For an evaluation of performance on oral work by the student (as recorded on tape for examination purposes) the instructor may accumulate a stock of performances on tape, made by students under examination conditions. He can arrange them in a scale according to overall performance. He can then, at examination time, arrange for members of his class to record an oral performance on another tape and compare these performances with his permanent collection in order to establish their relative position on the

scale. Of course the instructor will need, for his convenience to be thoroughly familiar with the permanent scale of performance through memorization, but most of the memorizing will have been done while the instructor is listening to the performances in assigning them their place in the scale. Generally he will reach a degree of recollection such that he can assign to a student's performance a rating on his scale without replaying from the tape of scaled performances, but on occasion he will wish to hear part of his track in order to feel sure of his rating of one or another of his students. This scale of performance will have most value in judging a relatively uncontrolled performance on an assigned topic or judging a reply to a trip-off question (one which will call for an extended reply). The use of the scale would probably be of less use in measuring the performance of students in question-response situations or in an interview. True, the interview situation might be psychologically the most stimulating to the student; the problem would be to set an interview atmosphere while doing as little interviewing as possible and getting the student to do as much free speaking as possible, that is, to use the word "interview" as a cover for the reality.

The practical advantage to the instructor in building his own recorded scale of performances is that he is comparing students he has taught with students he is teaching, and that gaps in his early list of performances will surely be made good in succeeding years, so that increasingly subtle distinctions and gradations can be achieved to the degree desired. Similarly, for the aural testing, a record of achievement over a number of years can give the instructor some assurance that his grading pattern is consistent.¹ If he finds that it is desirable to change his grading pattern even though his basis of comparison remains the same, he may reflect with some profit on the quality of students which his college or his country's educational system is producing.

VICTOR COUTANT

Central Michigan College

¹ The use of the word "objective" here would be to indorse the cynical definition of the word as a multiplication of subjectives.

Chappuzeau and a Matter of Language

The continual progress that is being made in the teaching of languages, developing as it has, techniques to hasten the student's arrival at oral fluency, has its sad side. We are wont to consider language and literature courses as distinctly separate aspects of pedagogy. There is a need to be reminded from time to time that a real appreciation of language goes beyond being able to order a meal. There are moments in literature when the matter of language may assume aesthetic and historical importance.

There are from time to time in literary history passages

that must undeservedly share the obscurity of the works to which they belong. One such passage is contained in Act I Scene 2 of Chappuzeau's *L'Avare Duppé* or *"Homme de Paille"* (1663). It is a scene in which the conventional juxtaposition of the love of the master for his beloved and that of his valet for his beloved's servant appears as a stylistic synthesis.

It is a clever moment when Lycaste and his valet Philip-pin declare their loves simultaneously to Isabelle and Lisette:

- Lycaste, "Où fuyez-vous, Madame?"
 Philippin, "Où fuyez-vous la belle?"
 Lycaste, "Quand percé de vos traits"
 Philippin, "Quand l'amour en cervelle"
 Lycaste, "Je puis enfin ici"
 Philippin, "Je puis finalement"
 Lycaste, "Vous dire mon soucy"
 Philippin, "Vous dire mon tourment"
 Lycaste, "Ma Flame"
 Philippin, "Mon brasier"
 Lycaste, "Ma passion"
 Philippin, "Ma rage."¹

Lycaste then proceeds with a neo-platonic utterance in quest of Isabelle's affection. Philippin sums up the difference between the two manners of expression as far as he is concerned: "Je t'aime, c'est assez, j'abhorre le long style." The troubadourian gentility of the one would, of course, escape the other. The master clothes his lady in an implicit beauty such that, even in flight, its arrows must pierce his heart. The emphasis here is on beauty as the agent that enables the lady to captivate her lover. Philippin's first remark is quite different, being a subjective judgment that sets the tone of his entire declaration which is in terms of "le moi." His admiration is something swirling about in his head, originating as it were in his own critical acumen with regard to the fair sex. Lycaste is a hopelessly wounded patient whose "je puis enfin" is best rendered in English as "I may at last," whereas Philippin, the boisterous egotist, expresses his impatience with "Je puis finalement," the best English translation of which would be "Finally, I can." For Lycaste, Isabelle is the object of solicitous care, who has aroused in him a flame that has kindled the suffering of passion. For Philippin, Lisette is the source of a tortuous burning akin to madness, bereft, it would seem, of all gentle glow.

This is an instructive passage in seventeenth century French comedy. It serves admirably to point out that despite the fundamental importance of the master-servant relationship in the comic genre, writers cared not at all about distinguishing realistically between the language of masters and that of their valets. Attempts to make some distinction were limited to filling the mouth of the servant with almost unutterable vulgarities or with precious nonsense. The result was in other words a language that was neither Mascarille's ideal (La Grange says of him "C'est un extravagant, qui s'est mis dans la tête de vouloir faire l'homme de condition. Il se pique ordinairement de galan-

terie et de vers." *Précieuses Ridicules* (I,1) nor something like that of Guillot, the valet in Chappuzeau's *L'Académie des Femmes* (1661) who, on one occasion, tells his employer, Hortense, after interrupting her repeatedly, "Tandis que je me mouche. Vous pouvez dire un mot."²

Writers tended to present this linguistic problem only in terms of black and white. Although there are many allusions in the theatre to the barbarism in the language of the servants and indeed illustrations of it, the extremes of the servant tongue are ordinarily completely lacking in verisimilitude and allow no sense of balance whatever between the French spoken by the master and those in his employ. This lack of balance in the matter of language is particularly noticeable in contrast to the marked equilibrium that exists in the social aspects of the master-servant relationship.

In the preface that Hauteroche wrote for his *Bourgeoises de Qualité* (1690), that author emphatically claims a novelty in the creation of his valet l'Espérance and states, "Ainsi, je puis dire surement qu'il y a du nouveau dans son caractère, dans ses sentiments and dans ses expressions."³ However, as Professor Lancaster has remarked, audiences apparently saw little novelty in the rôle.⁴ Hauteroche recognized but failed to solve this language problem that is suggested by the Lycaste-Philippin passage of the Chappuzeau play. It is to Chappuzeau's credit that in one brief moment at least he faced the problem on the only ground on which solution might have been possible, i.e., through recognition of the fact that a difference in the language used by the master and the valet had to be indicated, but to reflect their true relationship it had to be a moderate one. It is too bad that Chappuzeau's valets and masters in in other plays fall so readily into the language of conventional pattern found in other writers. And it is to be regretted that Hauteroche was to do no more than recognize the problem. As it was, the theatre continued to witness the absurdity of valets who spoke either exactly like their masters or in extremes that make their utterances artificial from the language point of view.

JOHN VAN EERDE

University of Rhode Island

¹ S. Chappuzeau, *L'Avare Duppé ou l'Homme de Paille* (Paris, 1663).

² S. Chappuzeau, *L'Académie des Femmes* (Paris, 1661).

³ Théâtre de Noël le Breton, *Les Bourgeoises de Qualité* (Paris 1772) III.

⁴ Henry Carrington Lancaster, *History of French Dramatic Literature* (Baltimore, 1942), Part IV, Vol. II, pp. 824-825.

Dr. Johnston Appointed as Specialist in Foreign Languages, U. S. Office of Education

In recognition of the increased importance of foreign languages in American life, the United States Office of Education recently added the position of Specialist for Foreign Languages to its Division of State and Local School Systems. This is a significant milestone, because foreign language teaching now takes its place with other subject-matter fields in the research and service program of the Office of Education. Appointed to the position is Dr. Marjorie C. Johnston, who has worked for several years in

the International Division of the Office of Education and who brings to the new assignment a wealth of experience in foreign language teaching and teacher education.

Marjorie Cecil Johnston was born in Missouri and educated in the public schools of Missouri and Texas. She received the Ph.D. degree at the University of Texas in 1939, followed by a year of post-doctoral research at Radcliffe College and the University of New Mexico.

In addition to ten years of teaching experience in the

public schools of Texas, Dr. Johnston has served on the faculties of Stephens College, The George Washington University, the Graduate School of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and, during summer sessions, the University of Texas, Texas State College for Women, and San Diego State College. From 1942 to 1946 she was employed in the Division of Inter-American Educational Relations of the U.S. Office of Education as Consultant in the Teaching of Spanish. In the summers of 1945 and 1946 she represented the Office of Education in Mexico as United States Director of the Spanish Language Institute, a special training program for U.S. teachers, sponsored by the Office of Education in cooperation with the Department of State and the

National University of Mexico. She had been in her previous position since 1950.

Dr. Johnston is a member of many honorary and professional organizations, having served in 1951 as President of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese. She is author of numerous textbooks and articles for educational journals. Most recently, she completed a comprehensive study of *Education in Mexico*, published as Government bulletin. She is a contributing editor to the *Handbook of Latin American Studies* (Library of Congress), *La Educación* (Pan American Union), and *Hispania* (American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese).

At Long Last . . .

United States diplomats risk losing their jobs if they can't speak a major foreign language well.

The State Department disclosed yesterday it will check nearly all its diplomats to learn whether they are fluent in one of the three "world languages"—French, Spanish or German.

Those who are not will be brought home as quickly as possible for special three to six months of intensive training in one of the languages.

If they fail to pick up a fluent speaking and reading

knowledge after instructions, they probably will be fired. Career ministers and ambassadors and political appointees who are holding down ambassador jobs overseas will be exempt.

Some 179 senior diplomats of class 1, career ministers or ambassadors, will be exempt from the check because the Department assumes they already have adequate knowledge of one of the necessary languages.

Washington *Evening Star* June 27, 1956

Italian on Television

ECCO L'ITALIA, a series of TV programs originated by Professor Norma V. Fornaciari of Roosevelt University, Chicago, was successfully presented from April 16 through

June 18. This is the first TV program in the United States for instruction in Italian.

Notice to Committee Members and State Chairmen of the Purin Survey of Teacher Training

By courtesy of the Executive Committee of the National Federation, a number of reprints of my recent article "Status of the Academic and Professional Training . . ." in Oct.-Dec. 1955 MLJ have been put at my disposition for distribution to workers on that survey. Dr. Purin has directed me to send copies to those persons concerned who wish such a reprint, the thought being that some persons

will not care to receive it or their copy printed in the MLJ will suffice. Will those persons who served in some capacity with Dr. Purin on his survey please write me (a postcard will do) requesting their copy. Address: Prof. James B. Tharp, Arps Hall 105A, Ohio State University, Columbus 10, Ohio.

Book Reviews

GEORGE, ALBERT J., *The Development of French Romanticism*. Syracuse, The Syracuse University Press, 1955. 193 pp.

The main thesis is the importance of the (French) Industrial Revolution with respect to the development of Romanticism. The author maintains that prior to 1830 that literary movement was apparently held together by a negative attitude, chiefly the objection of a number of young men of letters to neo-classical restraints. From 1830 on, a positive school was formed, coincident with the advent of said revolution and its concomitant factors (technological advance in printing, gains in educational facilities, creation of the modern newspaper) and new social-political problems raised by the dominance of the wealthy 'bourgeoisie' and the vocal aspirations of the down-trodden proletariat.

The results are evident in changes in 'genres.' After the hour of triumph brought about by the establishment of the *drame*, the transfer from poetry to prose as principal medium of literary expression, the appearance of the novel and, official criticism being effectively silenced, the school divided into a) a group of purists dedicated to the cult of 'art for art's sake', superior and aloof, and b) the 'Utilitarians' ready to cater to the now much larger public, and hence accepting the subsequent unavoidable lowering of standards.

The author concludes by saying that the above conditions and events were intertwined and related, although he does not attempt to demonstrate actual determinism or causality, contenting himself to offer the suggestion that the Industrial Revolution was indeed an important factor in the shaping of a new type of mass literature.

"The study of French Romanticism," Professor George states in his Introduction, "has provided scholars with one of the most entertaining and irritating of literary puzzles . . . vainly trying to reduce a complex series of disparate elements to a brief but satisfactory definition."

One will readily enough subscribe to that; for the last word on that baffling phenomenon has not been said as yet. Musset who was in the thick of the fray, a rebel among rebels, has his Dupuis and Cotonnet declare in the first letter: "Nous crûmes jusqu'en 1830 que le romantisme était l'imitation des Allemands, et nous y ajoutâmes les Anglais, sur le conseil qu'on nous en donna. . . . De 1830 à 1831 nous crûmes que le romantisme était le genre historique. . . . De 1831 à l'année suivante le genre intime. . . . De 1832 à 1833 il nous vint à l'esprit que le romantisme devait être un système de philosophie et d'économie politique. . . ."

A delightful state of perplexity has since prevailed as to the true nature of Romanticism and every critic feels free to offer his own interpretation, and usually does. Gustave Lanson's definition should of course be noted: a kind of literature characterized by lyricism as an expansion of individualism, dominated by imagination and sentiment, and "tout traversé de frissons métaphysiques," but with little

contact with the current of ideas prevailing at the time (thus J. de Maistre, P. Courier, Lamennais, Proudhon, A. Comte and the Saint-Simoniens remaining outside of the movement) and consequently, we may assume, not actually related to the ideological stirrings born of the Industrial Revolution.

This egocentric type of literature, so prone to violent crises, is, in the opinion of P. Lasserre, a sickening of the soul: "En cette disposition je vois une maladie." To L. Maigron it is a form of escape: "l'horreur de la réalité et le désir ardent d'y échapper." To E. Zola it is a phobia: "Tous les écrivains de l'école romantique sont caractérisés par cette haine de l'âge actuel." Apparently many are those who do not believe that, beyond the setting-up of literary chapels and mutual admiration societies, there ever was a true Romantic school. The author of this book, however, takes the more acceptable, and probably fairer view that such a school did exist and that "it signifies to most people a definite trend of history during which specific writers accepted the name to differentiate their particular kind of literature from all others"; and on that assumption he proceeds to show interaction with the 'milieu' of the period. At some length he depicts the growth of industrialism from the first locomotive (in 1827) through the phase of economic unrest, the ruthless 'grande bourgeoisie manufacturière' taking over under Louis-Philippe's régime, the development of printing (which we learn had hitherto remained as crudely inefficient as it was in the days of Gutenberg!), the appalling state of illiteracy, this in spite of Napoleon's efforts of "grandiose futility." General education is shown getting under way, gathering remarkable momentum, and a great reading public springing into existence, omnivorous, indiscriminating.

In the chapter titled "Search for New Content" we are told of the stalwarts of Romanticism who exulting over their triumph, their freedom having been won, were none the less hard put to it to make real headway; for aside from grandiloquent manifestoes, metrical innovations and the democratization of words, ("poetic" words were replaced by the *terme propre* and "spades became shovels"), no absolute leadership prevailed. This is understandable, for as Lanson has it: "Lamartine ne daignait, Vigny ne pouvait faire un chef d'école" but "V. Hugo avait pour ce rôle puissance et volonté." Later when the movement as such appeared spent, which occurred when its essential role of a revolt was acted out, Hugo became the embodiment of the whole school; then, around 1840, the "écho sonore" will swell to majestic proportions, and (Lanson again): "il fera effort pour être la pensée du siècle . . . demi-journaliste, demi-prophète."

Meantime the so-called school turned to various experiments: the historical novel, Christianity, the Middle Ages, foreign models under the aegis of Goethe, Shakespeare, Scott, Byron; all those attempts short-lived, however, probably for lack of faultless masterpieces.

Prose became definitely the thing for the new public

which was 'bourgeois' and little given to flights into the realm of fancy, a far-cry from the 1820's when the *Premières Méditations* aroused such fervor in the young of heart! This age of prose was also best suited to the new aspirations of the ever-growing cities (poverty and vice ridden as they became).

Then it was that "a large number of romanticists would identify themselves with the workers' claims and social justice . . . and became heirs to the humanitarianism of the 18th century, imbued with a Messianic urge to lead the people to social salvation."

Prose and the desire to fight in behalf of the underdog, and the need of a proper medium (and this found in the creation of the modern newspaper thanks to Emile de Girardin, the pioneer—the sinews of war provided by paying advertising) establish the link and the passage. We are shown that 'crusade' as a prosperous venture: the great and semi-great unable to resist the lure, and the mission somewhat forgotten, we observe the feeding of the 'pulp' to the plebs, and behold! the birth of the 'feuilleton'!

That a break should have taken place between the 'practical' Romanticists (the 'Utilitarians') and those bent on serving their cause, 'la liberté dans l'art et la liberté de l'art', was unavoidable. Thus the latter became committed to an ideal of beauty to which all types of artistic endeavors (no longer kept separated) contributed and the kingdom of 'Bohemia' was formed, Gautier, the painter-writer showing the way. This, as Professor George aptly remarks, led directly to the creation of the Parnassian School, often regarded as a reaction against the excessive emotional outpourings of romantic ego-centricity. So, meantime, those who kept the faith, if only for a while, heaped scorn upon the 'shopkeepers,' or as the fiery Gautier phrased it: "Des vers et puis des vers et encore des vers . . . il faut laisser la prose aux boutiquiers des boulevards."

In the interval the 'people's literature' got its start in the 'chanson-clubs' (the 'goguettes') under the initial impulse given by Béranger above all, and derived solace and pride in helping to create a new epic, the Napoleonic legend.

The author devotes a very instructive chapter to the evolution of this 'people's literature' (this one may take to be the chief proof of his argument). Eventually the movement through some peculiar twist of fate would shift its center of gravity, and discarding nationalism for international creed, would merge with the socialistic and Marxist currents. It is probably in that light that Thiers wrote: "Le Romantisme, c'est la Commune," and Gustave Lanson: "Le romantisme en son fond était révolutionnaire et anarchique."

A goodly part of the work of the author is devoted to the development of the novel. To him, the *genre* did not really exist in its true form until Balzac and Stendhal took matters in hand. We must agree that most of what passed for *romans* before they began to write were merely *romances*. Yet there may be cause for disagreement over the dismissal of the *Princesse de Clèves*, of the *Nouvelle Héloïse* and especially of *Manon Lescaut* as genuine examples of the *genre*. Likewise, if we will admit that the French novel of to-day is (for better or worse) a psychological analysis, we must accept as such those early models: *Obermann* (1804), *Adolphe* (1816), *Volupté* (1834) and even some of George

Sand's personal fictions that precede the more true-to-life productions of the realist school.

As a rule it is nevertheless quite right to condemn as hybrid forms these violent effusions which were coming off the presses in great quantities; what the critic Nisard called "la littérature facile," by the sheer weight of its mediocrity stunted the growth of the incipient public taste.

But there was a public for it: the women, particularly those of the middle class, all the Emma Bovarys who sought to flee from the harshness of that materialistic era. Through them as prototypes and by them as readers the literary hacks of 'romanesque' outpourings waxed prosperous. Back to Rousseau then by all means! Back to his morals founded on passion, his "fatal présent du ciel" . . . In his book: *Le Romantisme et les Mœurs*, Maigron notes the crescendo of 'séparations,' cases of adultery and loosening of the family ties; in this manner marriage, the bulwark of respectable bourgeoisie, was sadly breached, and Romantic frenzy triumphed once again, with the trend to suicide because of unrequited love as its final motif.

Other very interesting chapters should, if space permitted, be discussed; among them the one dealing with the "New Mythology" of the Romantic school. . . .

In conclusion, in spite of a number of points about which divergencies of opinions must of necessity be entertained, one will find in a careful perusal of this work that it stands up well enough under scrutiny, being clearly and dispassionately put together, and in many respects refreshingly new.

ANDRÉ CÉLIÈRES

Boston University

BROOKS, NELSON, and others, *MLA Teacher's Guide, Beginning French in Grade Three*. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1955, pp. xi+77. \$2.00.

One of the principal achievements of the MLA FL Program for the year 1955 was the publication of an experimental edition of the MLA Teacher's Guide, *Beginning French in Grade Three*, described on the cover as "A Course of Study Including Methods, Materials, and Aids for Teaching Conversational French to Third-Grade Children," and hereinafter referred to as "the Guide." The members of the working committee which produced the Guide are Nelson Brooks, Yale University (Chairman); Marguerite Ericksson, York Public Schools, York, Pa.; Robert L. Politzer, Harvard University; Susan B. Scott, Allen-Stevenson School, New York City; Sylvia Smith, Princeton Public Schools, Princeton, N. J.; Mary P. Thompson, Fairfield Public Schools, Fairfield, Conn.; and Olga Scherer Virski, Yale University. The editorial supervisor of the project was Kenneth W. Mildener, Assistant Director of the MLA FL Program. Preliminary drafts of the matter included in the Guide were submitted for examination and criticism to some thirty-five teachers of foreign languages and others, some of whom have had experience with the teaching of French or some other modern foreign language at the elementary-school level. It is impossible to say to what extent suggestions coming from members of this group are reflected in the published edition of the Guide. However, a comparison of that edition with the first preliminary draft

indicates that no important changes were made in the fundamental content and form of the teaching units as a result of suggestions from members of the Advisory Committee.

After a brief foreword by William R. Parker, then Executive Secretary of the MLA and Director of the MLA FL Program, there is a long and rather pedantic introduction which contains a number of statements "About this Teacher's Guide," some remarks on "objectives," classified as "linguistic," "cultural," and "educational," and several pages of "Tips for the Teacher." Next follow 24 French units, beginning with an adaptation of the customary "Bonjour, mes élèves," and ending with a make-believe TV show, and six "floating units" dealing with a gym class, Christmas, games, field trips, birthdays, and natural sciences. Numbers 6, 12, and 18 are "review units." Five appendixes provide a number of songs, review questions, references for teachers, some classroom games not mentioned in the units, and some French names for boys and girls.

In general, the units which introduce new matter are made up of two parts: material and directions. In approximately half of the units the material is presented in three sections: (1) a "repetition exercise," (2) a "response exercise," and (3) one or more types of "dramatic exercise." The directions, whenever they occur, offer suggestions for the use of the material found in the units. Minimum content, referred to as "A" materials, is indicated for each unit, while additional related content, referred to as "B" materials, is provided in most of the units for classes which have more than the minimum amount of time available for French. Now and then a song or a game is recommended, or some other auxiliary exercise such as counting. Such items, apparently, are always auxiliary and never basic in the teaching of the minimum content. The authors of the Guide state that in preparing each unit they gave thought to Linguistics, Grammar and Syntax, Pattern Variation, Situation: Category and Content, Vocabulary and Idiom, American Culture, French Culture, Audio-Visual Aids, Literature, Recreation, Music, and Art.

A record is available ("authentic French voices speaking most of the material in the Guide"). One 12-inch LP disk, \$5.00, Modern Language Association, 6 Washington Square North, New York 3, N. Y.

One may hardly presume, of course, to evaluate very reliably a publication of this nature without first trying it out in practical teaching situations. However, some observations may not be completely out of order. The authors of this first MLA Teacher's Guide were indeed confronted with a stern challenge. Since French has been taught successfully from the primary grades on for many years in many schools in the United States, it goes without saying that some more or less satisfactory teaching materials have been produced. In fact, some of these materials have been tested for many years during which they have been constantly revised and improved on the basis of experience with them. Even though the authors of the MLA Teacher's Guide may not have hoped to be able to produce the ideal guide for the teacher's use, it was expected that they would produce a better guide than any of those already published. Otherwise, of course, there could be little justification for

expenditure of time and effort to produce just another teacher's guide. Furthermore, the MLA Teacher's Guide can be of extraordinary importance to the profession, since it is likely to take on something like authoritative status because it is sponsored and distributed by the Modern Language Association of America. Certainly, the authors of the Guide are to be commended for their efforts to meet the challenge which confronted them.

It would be most unfortunate if the publication and distribution of this guide should give to administrators and teachers the impression that the Modern Language Association believes that the third grade is the ideal level at which to start the study of a second language in American elementary schools. Since it is fairly obvious that there is nothing in the units which makes them applicable particularly to the third grade (the authors themselves intimate that the units may be adapted for use in either the second or the fourth grade), it seems equally obvious that the Guide has been called "Beginning French in Grade Three," because it seemed expedient to suggest that the study of French might well be started at that level, rather than earlier as many prefer.

It is unfortunate, in our opinion, that an edition of this guide has been published and promulgated with the approval of an important professional organization without first having been tested for at least a year by actual use in practical teaching situations. Since, according to the foreword, the production of the Guide "was called for by many teachers entering for the first time upon this adventure," it should have been possible to offer to these many inexperienced teachers, as a more or less authoritative publication sponsored by an important national organization of scholars, a tried product which they might expect to use with satisfaction and safety, rather than a completely untried guide which they themselves might have to whip into shape. Unfortunate as this situation may be, it should be pointed out, however, that those in charge of the production of the Guide hope to be able to revise it on the basis of reports from teachers who attempt to use the experimental edition. To aid users in preparing their reports, a "Periodic Evaluation Sheet" is inserted after each review unit and a "Summary Questionnaire for the Term" at the end of each body of matter intended for a semester's use, on which users are urged to answer certain questions on the basis of their experience with the Guide. The questions on the Periodic Evaluation Sheets have to do specifically with the character of the French employed in the units concerned, the amount of time required to "cover" each unit, suggested "methods" found especially effective, as well as those found ineffective, and devices invented or added by the teacher to improve the units. While the term "cover" is not defined, it may be assumed from statements in the introduction that mastery of the "A" materials found in the unit is implied. Users of the Guide are urged to report their experience with it and their suggestions for its improvement.

In our opinion, the material found in the present edition of the Guide is too much and too difficult for an elementary-school grade and quite out of the question for the average third-grade group. Some of the good suggestions found in the "Tips for the Teacher" section of the introduction do

not seem to be illustrated in the units. While the importance of the principle of over-learning, for instance, seems to be recognized in the introductory remarks, it is not implemented in the units. In fact, some of the speech patterns which are evidently intended to be mastered are not repeated at all. Our experience indicates that seemingly inordinate repetition is required to insure mastery of even a relatively small number of basic speech patterns. Certainly, complete aural-oral command of a considerable number of such speech patterns must be achieved if any appreciable facility in conversational French is to be acquired at any school level. In our opinion, adequate repetition of basic speech patterns, with very gradual and subtle addition of new patterns which are also repeated sufficiently, is not provided in the experimental edition of the Guide.

To us there seems to be considerable confusion, or at least inconsistency, in the Guide in the matter of terminology. "Method," for instance, seems to be confused with "teaching device," and there seems to be the rather usual confusion as to what constitutes conversational French and also as to what is meant by the term "aural-oral approach." While the authors state that the basic purpose of the Guide is "the teaching of real conversational French in real situations," the conversations illustrated can hardly be considered models of normal conversations such as normal third-grade pupils might be expected to conduct. In order to learn to converse in French, pupils must practice conversing in French. A practice exercise in which the teacher asks questions and the pupil answers, if he can, is never "real" conversation and seldom produces worthwhile results. The ASTP taught us that, if we did not know it before. In fact, the very important principle of inter-pupil practice, which lies at the foundation of any real success in the teaching of conversation at any grade level, seems to have been minimized in the Guide, especially in the first half. While the importance of dramatization is certainly recognized by the authors, our experience leads us to believe that more popular forms of dramatic exercise are required, especially as motivating experiences. In the introduction the authors intimate that the aural-oral approach is employed in the units. The term "aural-oral approach" (it was "oral-aural" in the first preliminary draft of the Guide) certainly implies a direct approach if it implies anything. Apparently, however, the approach to a new French speech pattern preferred by the authors of the Guide, if they mean what they say on page 2, is an approach via English translated into French, the exact opposite of the direct approach.

It is a little difficult to see why both the "repetition exercise" and the "response exercise" occur in many of the units, since the former is surely quite unnecessary if the latter is in acceptable form.

One of the most notable defects in the present edition of the Guide is the lack of an adequate number and variety of suggested teaching devices. Surprisingly enough, many good devices which have been employed successfully at the elementary-school level are not mentioned. New teachers will have no difficulty in finding suitable material in French for use at any grade level. What to do with the material is the real problem. It is hoped, therefore, that users of the experimental edition of the Guide will include in their reports suggestions for more and better teaching devices. If

enough good suggestions are sent in and if the revisers are in a position to make due use of them it is possible that the MLA Teacher's Guide may yet become a genuinely co-operative enterprise and that the revised edition, if one appears, may be a better and a safer manual to put into the hands of the inexperienced teacher.

STEPHEN L. PITCHER

St. Louis Public Schools

ROMAINS, JULES, *Deux Nouvelles*. Edited by Fernand Vial and Santina C. Vial. New York: The Dryden Press, 1956, pp. xii+272. \$2.60.

Admirers of Jules Romain will welcome this interesting and characteristic example of his work, intended for use in intermediate or advanced college French courses. The two *nouvelles*, each one about a hundred pages long, have been formed by piecing together various scattered chapters appearing in volumes 25 to 27 of *Les Hommes de bonne volonté*. This editorial task has been carried out very skillfully, producing two novelettes which are complete, coherent, and quite readable.

Both stories take place in 1933. The first one, *Le Petit Charles*, recounts the relationships between a fourteen year old war orphan, Charles Xavier, and his *correspondant* or sponsor, an itinerant electrician named Vidal. The latter gets acquainted with the boy at the orphanage where he has been raised and takes him on a vacation trip through north-eastern France. They travel in Vidal's truck, occasionally stopping to perform electrical repairs in villages along the way, and eventually make a pilgrimage to the battlefield near Verdun where Charles's father had been killed. Their trip has its moments of excitement, notably a melodramatic encounter with the former captain of Vidal's regiment. The boy grows much attached to his sponsor and, ultimately, obtains permission to leave the orphanage, becoming the electrician's apprentice and foster son. This narrative possesses considerable human appeal but it may prove rather dull to most American students. They are not much interested in the aftermath of World War I in France and they are not likely to share Vidal's verbose enthusiasm for all the details of his trade.

The second novelette, *Françoise*, will be more widely appreciated. Here Jules Romain describes quite a different social background, again with expert knowledge of his subject, and this time succeeds in writing a poignant, charming love story. Françoise Maleux, whose parents have suddenly lost their fortune in the financial crisis, works as a career girl at a civil service post in Paris. She has been deeply moved by the works of the famous novelist, Pierre Jallez (who is one of the key personalities in *Les Hommes de bonne volonté* and in ways a portrait of Jules Romain himself). They exchange a few letters, then meet face to face, spend several hours in long walks through the city streets, go to the theater together, and soon discover that they love and need each other. The two main characters are clearly defined and they possess certain traits in common—moral dignity, zest for life, and a feeling for beauty—which render them quite admirable and appealing. Their love story stands out as one of the high points in the 27 volumes of *Les Hommes de bonne volonté*.

This text has been prepared with great care and is very handsomely printed, in spite of a few typographical errors,

e.g. on pages 35 and 110. It offers a valuable introduction which discusses the literary career of Jules Romains, a good bibliography, numerous footnotes (although not nearly enough of them, I feel, to solve the problems of the average student), and a very thorough vocabulary which runs to almost eighty pages.

The extensive vocabulary suggests, perhaps, the rather limited usefulness of this book. It is too difficult for second-year college courses. The style of Jules Romains abounds in technical words, in colloquial expressions, in idiomatic usages characteristic of various social groups. On the other hand, for students who have had at least two or three years of French, the book could provide a rewarding insight into the language, or literature, or civilization, of contemporary France. It might serve extremely well, I think, for study and discussion in advanced conversation courses. Jules Romains is unexcelled as a documentary writer and he records with great authenticity, although sometimes with little art, the ways in which Frenchmen live and speak.

PHILIP A. WADSWORTH

University of Illinois

LEWIS, W. H., *The Sunset of the Splendid Century*. New York: William Sloane Associates, 1955. 320 pp. \$5.00.

Three years ago Mr. Lewis published his *The Splendid Century*, a study of the life and times of Louis XIV, in which the emphasis was "on classes rather than individuals, with problems of government and policy rather than with private lives." The present volume, he is quick to point out early in his foreword, may be termed a sequel to the earlier one, but in it he attempts to tell the story of the century's decline (and to tell it he must refer to the days of glory as well) as reflected in the life of Louis Auguste de Bourbon, Duc du Maine, bastard son of Mme de Montespan and Louis XIV. I daresay that most readers will agree that he has done a good job in rather small compass.

The book begins with the eighteen-year-old Louis XIV's first love affair (far different from later ones) and proceeds on to the end of his life and that of the uncomprehending and irresponsible wife of this son in 1753. Through its pages pass many of the great and near-great of the period, and we, at times, almost lose sight of the Duc du Maine himself in the sketching in of the background and the relating in broad outline of the lives and careers that crossed or collided with that of the principal character and his wife. A glance at the Index (pp. 305-320) shows how many names have a part in the story of the "sunset" of the century and the almost total eclipse of the Duc du Maine as a power to be reckoned with in the policies and intrigues of the court of the Regent.

St. Simon, Louis de Rouvroy, in Mr. Lewis's story of the century, looms large as the *bête noire* in the life of the Duc du Maine and the era in general. The Condé family does not fare much better, nor does the Regent, Philippe, Duc d'Orléans. The Duchesse du Maine, a stupid, frivolous creature, virtually forced upon her husband by the power politics of the court, was certainly no help to her husband at any time in his career. He is, by the way, presented as a man of ability but lacking in force and decision; this may have been due in part to his physical deformity, but certainly that is not the whole explanation of a career that

reaches great heights and then is thrown into violent reverse.

The book gives a good picture of the social life of the last half of the seventeenth century and the first four or five decades of the eighteenth. We see the social attitudes, callousness, indifference, and petty bickerings for position and prestige, (such as "l'affaire du bonnet") and the silly jealousies that lead slowly and surely to 1789, without their participants realizing where the country was headed.

Fifteen well-chosen illustrations of both people and places add greatly to the book's interest. Few pages are without brief, but adequate, biographical footnotes, and a genealogical table of the royal house helps us place the subject in his or her correct time and place; without them the book would be almost incomprehensible for most readers who are not scholars in the period, and for them the book is certainly not intended. It is, I dare say, a welcome and useful addition to the vast amount of material that has already been written on this important period in the history of France. It can well serve as useful background material for courses in literature (there is, however, naturally no preoccupation with literature *per se* in the book itself) of the last half of the seventeenth century and that of the early years of the Age of Enlightenment.

WM. MARION MILLER

Miami University

DEMAREST, DON L. AND SHAW, EDWARD P., *French Civilization through Fiction*. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1956, pp. vii+308 \$3.25.

Professors Demarest and Shaw have admirably accomplished the purpose stated in the title of this superb reader for intermediate college and advanced high school classes. The works of fiction, consisting of 13 short stories and 4 excerpts from novels, have intrinsic literary merit and at the same time are brilliant portrayals of fundamental aspects of French civilization. They are accompanied by a series of exceptionally perceptive essays written by the editors.

The literary selections are grouped in three parts: Major Character Traits, Social Structure, and Basic Institutions and Beliefs, which are in turn divided into 15 topics treating the relations of man to society and to the universe, *le bon sens*, the various classes in French society, the family, religion, education, patriotism, a definition of civilization, and the meaning of liberty and fraternity. The editors indicate a sense of pedagogical realism, for these stories vary in range from light-hearted humor to heroic sacrifice to, poignant tragedy, as can be seen from the following sample of authors and works: Daudet (*Le Sous-Préfet aux champs*), Giono (*La Femme du boulanger*), de Maupassant (*La Ficelle*), Romain (Le 6 octobre), France (*Le Livre de mon ami*), Kessel (*L'Embarquement pour Gibraltar*), Duhamel (*Civilisation*), and Saint-Exupéry (*Lettre à un bûcher*). With a few exceptions, which are carefully indicated, the works are given in their entirety. Only *L'Embarquement pour Gibraltar* suffers, in my opinion, by deletions from the complete text.

Excellent original essays in English, varying in length from two to four pages, introduce each of the 15 topics. In these essays the editors not only comment on the French

text, but they also relate the topic to appropriate sociological, political, historical, and cultural aspects of French civilization. While displaying a profound knowledge and a critical appreciation of France (and incidentally a fine command of the English language), the editors have wisely refrained from submerging their basic ideas under a mass of details. However, some of the footnotes, expert little essays in themselves, also deal succinctly with subjects such as sports, the rise and fall of French cabinets, French explorers, trade unions, religions, drinking habits, the Ecole Normale Supérieure, scientists, artists, musicians, and France as a haven for refugees.

The same high standards are maintained in the technical details and in the treatment of vocabulary. This text has an attractive appearance, good print, and the pages are unencumbered in spite of line markers, a visible page vocabulary, and footnotes. Eight clear reproductions of French paintings serve as the only illustrations; the two endpaper maps, one a relief map of France, the other a map of Paris, enable the student to locate easily places and streets mentioned in the stories. The visible page vocabulary is meticulous in translation and further demonstrates the editors' attention to teaching problems by the selection of words and idioms; the end vocabulary is almost perfect, except for the omission of a small number of French words used in the English essays (*mariage de convenance*, p. 70; *ruelles, salons*, p. 71; *badinage*, pp. 72, 83; *militants*, p. 111; *flambeau*, p. 132). Vocabulary and literary explanations in the footnotes are concise and accurate. I noted only two misprints (p. 49, line 5; p. 182, lines 17-18); and it is not the editors' fault that the recent elections changed the Communists' representation from about one-seventh to about one-fourth of the National Assembly (p. 112). The literary selections are followed by questionnaires in French which test the narrative content, while a series of questions in English seek value judgments from the student.

It has rarely been this reviewer's pleasure to examine a book that comes as close to being a perfect text as does *French Civilization through Fiction*.

GERALD A. BERTIN

Rutgers University

WILDHAGEN, KARL AND HÉRAUCOURT, WILL, *English-German German-English Dictionary*. Wiesbaden: Brandstetter Verlag and London: Allen & Unwin. Vol. I, 6th ed., 1956, pp. xxii+822; vol. II, 1st ed., 1953, pp. xxvi+1345.

The English-German volume of the dictionary was completed by the late Karl Wildhagen, who was professor of English philology at the University of Kiel. Its first edition appeared in 1938. It was revised by the author in the second (1943) and third editions (1946). It contains also a select pronouncing vocabulary of proper names (pp. 777-804) and a list of abbreviations and contractions in general use (805-822). The dictionary bears the descriptive subtitle "a comprehensive and strictly scientific representation of the vocabulary of the modern and present-day languages, with special regard to syntax, style, and idiomatic usage." It seems obvious that special attention was given to modern and contemporary British English, while "the language of the United States, which has constantly

and largely influenced English slang, has been taken into account as far as possible." The only pronunciation indicated is the one found in Daniel Jones' *English Pronouncing Dictionary* (4th ed., 1937). All instructions and prefaces are bilingual, but some of the less common English entries contain German glosses or definitions rather than German equivalents, which is awkward for the English-speaking user, e.g. *Thomism* "die auf Thomas v. Aquino zurückgehende Philosophie," *real* "span. Silbermünze," *quadri-vium* "höhere Abteilung der Freien Künste im Mittelalter," *requiem* also "die Musik dazu." The entry *fog* contains as the German equivalent not *Nebel* but "dichter, über dem Erdboden schwebender Nebel."

After Professor Wildhagen's death Will Héraucourt, now professor of English at the University of Marburg, was asked by the publishers to take over the editorship of the German-English volume, since he had himself collected a great deal of material for a dictionary of his own. As the publishers express it in a multilingual "German" sentence, Héraucourt always looked for "*mutatis mutandis* ein möglichst genaues Äquivalent als *le mot juste* in der lebendigen englischen und amerikanischen Sprache" (p. XV). Héraucourt states in his own preface that his dictionary was the first one to include all varieties of German from slang to the standard language; German slang was no less picturesque than the English or the American slang. He takes credit for the first systematic attempt at bringing "*syntax and style*, which have hitherto always suffered neglect, within the framework of the word-material." The editor's objectives deserve hearty approval. Equivalents for colloquial and slang expressions are infrequently encountered in available dictionaries; they are apt to puzzle the uninitiated when they are heard in conversation or seen in print. It is often not easy to provide expressions equivalent in usage level for those found in German or English. Colloquial and slang terms are much more restricted as to region and time of currency than standard idioms. Usually British slang translates North German regional slang terms, e.g. *Wonnekloss* "delightful baby and plump as a partridge," *einfach Puppe!* "that's the bee's knees!" Often the editor attempts also to provide American equivalents, e.g., "yummy!" for the latter expression above.

The editor has decided to restrict the phonetic transcription of German to a minimum, because German orthography renders German phonemes consistently most of the time. Thus he indicates the position of the main stress in every word, but fails to call attention to the long quantities in words like *Erde, Schwert, Arzt, zart*, to the voiceless finals in *Bad, lieb, Weg*, the spirant in *-ig*, the short stressed vowel in *vierzehn, vierzig*, etc. The key to the phonetic transcription (p. XXII) erroneously suggests different values for the stressed vowels in *Gänse, Ente* and in *Bett*, and a difference in quantity between the stressed vowels of *Frisör* and *lötten*. The editor indicates the pronunciation of foreign words in German that have retained features of their foreign pronunciation: e.g., *Bonbon, Ballon, Balkon, Bluff, Plafond, Plaid*. He seems to favor the common North German substitution of a velar nasal for the French nasalized vowels: *Bonbon* [bɔŋbɔŋ] which is not recognized by Siebs and appears provincial or substandard in the South. It would seem even less acceptable if used by an English-speaking person. It is surprising but

probably revealing that among the *Benutzte Literatur* (Books Consulted, p. xxi) neither Siebs' *Bühnenaussprache* nor Viëtor's *Deutsches Aussprachewörterbuch* are mentioned.

The 40,000 entries of the dictionary have been carefully arranged and illustrated in idiomatic sentences of the same usage level. A list of geographical names is appended to the dictionary (pp. 1245-1265). We noticed there that *Burgenland*, one of Austria's provinces, was only glossed as "Teil der ungarischen Tiefebene." Lists of personal names, of abbreviations and contractions, of measures, weights and currencies follow. The tables illustrating German conjugations and declensions (pp. 1327-1338) may not completely conform to the standards of modern descriptive linguistics but contain all pertinent information. A list of English irregular verbs, a note on American orthography (p. 1344) and one on American pronunciation (p. 1345) conclude the volume. In American English the vowels of *soap*, *date* are stated to be monophthongs. Medial *d* in *little* and the lack of a diphthong in the weakly stressed syllable of *agile* are called careless ("salopp") American pronunciations.

The attractive volumes of the dictionary are typographically and in their appearance a credit to their publishers. They represent altogether a welcome addition to the available tools for translation work in the two languages concerned.

HERBERT PENZL

University of Michigan

PFEFFER, J. ALAN, *A Guide to the German Verb*. Buffalo, New York: University Bookstore, 1956, pp. ii+18 qto. Paper. \$0.45.

This handy booklet in large and clear print will be welcomed by beginners and advanced students alike. It answers their questions concerning the identification of weak, strong, and mixed verbs and presents a seven page alphabetical index with cross-references to all forms which deviate from the "regular" norm. This permits quick recognition of such difficult verbs as *gor* (from *gären*), *schloß* (from *schlafen*), *soll* (from *sieden*), and *zieh* (from *ziehen*). Graduate students taking their reading examination will especially appreciate this feature because of the time element involved.

There are no misprints in this carefully prepared guide. The reviewer offers but a few minor suggestions. Page 3 could read "Its vowel or ablaut variations. . . ." "Geflossen *see* fließen" should be added on page 6 and the strong forms of "schrauben" and "schneiben" on page 10 could be marked "obsolete." Lastly "Sie" on page 12 might be described as "the formal (polite form of) address" and the poetic "ihr reiset," replaced with the traditional form "ihr reist."

ALBERT SCHOLZ

Syracuse University

SPANN, MENO AND LEOPOLD, WERNER, F., *Wallenstein*. "Progressive German Readers" (Book Five). Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1955, pp. iv+58. \$0.64.

The fifth text in this series presents the story of Wallenstein's last days, together with an introduction to Schiller and his play *Wallenstein*. The material is written in a form

suited to reading on the elementary level and the authors have achieved simplicity and a commendable balance between description and action.

Part I deals with Wallenstein's personality and the magnetic qualities that could attract ardent followers and induce envy or hate among antagonists. Here the partisans take sides to inform the reader about the political implications of Wallenstein's wavering decision between loyalty and treason, between the Emperor and the Swedes. These views are presented against the background of the Thirty Years' War. They stand forth simply and clearly, with attention to important details; the result is that even the uninformed reader can grasp the issues at stake, the opposing forces in the conflict, and the part played by each figure in this exciting and awful period in German history. A series of episodes is used to illustrate various aspects of the conflict and to illuminate personal characteristics of Wallenstein. The brutality of the military toward the civilian is illustrated in the murder of a sympathetic secretary. Wallenstein's prodigious memory for names recalls that of the coachman Karel after six years. The dreams of the gouty and febrile general give him the illusion that his fate is like that of other great figures in history. There is his faith in astrology, the rising suspicion among his subordinates, and the conspiracy against his life. Its execution provides the story with a strong climax.

Part II introduces the reader to the figure of Wallenstein in history and literature. It moves on to Schiller as a man, dramatist and historian, with attention to his views on the relation of literature to history. Admirers of *Wallenstein* will appreciate the ensuing retelling of the whole plot. Selected passages from the play lend an atmosphere of intimacy with the original. Observant students will discern quickly the parallel between the ideas and events of the two parts of the text and will recognize the devices and repetition that produce the impression of vividness and clarity in the simple language.

In these days when *Wallenstein* is in eclipse as a text, this book is a welcome effort to restore valuable and interesting material to the classroom. The authors deserve much credit for creating a suitable vocabulary and style for beginners. The editing follows that of the whole series. There is an end vocabulary and also one in the form of footnotes page by page. Particularly useful in the latter is the device of breaking compounds down into their parts. A set of exercises provide material for drill and for review. The text is free from typographical errors.

ANTHONY SCENNA

Amherst College

STEER, ALFRED G., JR., *Goethe's Social Philosophy as revealed in Campagne in Frankreich and Belagerung von Mainz*. Number fifteen of the "University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures." Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1955. Pp. xiv, 178. Paper \$4.00. Cloth \$5.00.

In essence, the investigation at hand centers upon a family concept which Steer derives from Goethe's scientific studies and which he uses in an analysis to demonstrate that the *Campagne-Belagerung* is a deeply significant

statement on the poet's social philosophy, developed in reaction to the French Revolution.

In the introduction to the study, Steer reviews the opinions of the principal annotators of the *Campagne-Belagerung*, including Chuquet, Roethe, Dove, Kunz and Buchwald. He agrees that the two accounts reflect, in the manner of *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, Goethe's personal experiences in the late summer and fall of 1792 and in the summer of 1793. However, Steer also insists that the apparent lack of unity of the *Campagne* is only illusory; that the *Campagne* and the *Belagerung* actually form "an organically united whole" which mirrors "the shattering effect of the French Revolution" on the poet and his contemporaries (p. 3); and that any views to the contrary are "due to a failure to see the functional importance of the family concept" in the two "autobiographical" reports (p. 9).

The family idea itself is predicated upon the assumption that the approaching French Revolution moved Goethe to apply to the social sphere the morphological method he had developed in his scientific preoccupations. Steer holds that the "family" must have occurred to the poet, "either as the type or the archetype of human association, or as one of the simpler elements in the series of (changing) phenomena" (p. 12). But the evidence which he adduces in support of the family concept is tenuous: Goethe's *Versuch, die Metamorphose der Pflanzen zu erklären* (published in 1790), his views on the influence of environment in the *Versuch einer allgemeinen Vergleichungslehre* (written in 1792), his notion of series in the *Entwurf einer allgemeinen Einleitung in die vergleichende Anatomie* (completed in 1793), and his ideas on organization expressed in a lecture *Über die Gesetze der Organisation überhaupt* (delivered in 1795), among others, suffice to persuade Steer that "Mutterpflanze," "Vielfaches," "Mannigfaltiges" and "scheinbar verbundenes Ganzes" are but synonyms in the poet's sociological vocabulary for any of which the word "Familie" could be substituted without doing violence to the sense of the passage (p. 17). Moreover, Goethe's portrayal of the folk in *Das Römische Karnival* (first made public in 1789) as a "gesetzlich bewegtes Ganzes" (Jockers) leads Steer to discern in the poet's morphological and sociological thinking "the family (which), like any other type, appears in a threefold capacity: (firstly) it is the maternal, life producing force, the impulse from which all striving for original form originates; secondly it is the goal toward self-fulfilment; and finally it is the corrective principle which either holds violent actions in check or strengthens weaker elements so that they can resist attack successfully" (p. 19).

The analysis, to which 144 of the 178 pages of the study are given over, is a running, discursive commentary with a leitmotif. The thread is the "composite" family concept. Although the word "Familie" is mentioned only casually (perhaps four or five times) in the *Campagne-Belagerung*, Steer's fertile imagination seizes upon "no less than three families" on the first page of the *Campagne*: "three extralegal domestic relationships" or "pathological forms" (p. 33), as he puts it. He has reference, of course, to the French ladies whom Goethe reports meeting at a luncheon upon his arrival in Mainz, the "Frauenzimmer, die (er) mit Auf-

merksamkeit zu betrachten Ursache hatte; die eine . . . die Geliebte des Herzogs von Orleans . . . Eine Tochter, die Mutter darstellend . . . (und) die Fürstin Monaco, unterschiedene Freundin des Prinzen von Condé, die weder so gespannt noch aufgeregt (schien) als die übrige Gesellschaft, die denn freilich in Hoffnung, Sorgen und Beängstigung lebte. . . ."

In the conclusion, Steer concedes that Goethe nowhere defines a group or a family; that he lists nowhere explicitly the proper family principles or goals; and that he does not state anywhere precisely what the qualities of a good family are (p. 166). If the *Campagne-Belagerung* is a deeply significant statement on the poet's social philosophy, developed in reaction to the French Revolution, it is yet to be demonstrated.

J. ALAN PFEFFER

The University of Buffalo

MARE, MARGARET, *Am Gipfel*. London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1954, pp. xi+226. Illustrated.

Although it is intended as a "Reader and Grammar for the General Certificate" in English schools, *Am Gipfel* may well be adapted to the early third year of German in American secondary schools. The author recommends that it follow her *Bergauf* and be used in conjunction with other texts, possibly a simple composition book and readers. Her aim is to "give a useful vocabulary, . . . glimpses of Germany, of the Germans, and of their cultural background as may arouse in the pupils a desire to know more of these."

This little book has much within it to justify the author's stated aim. Ninety pages are devoted to the story in twenty chapters of quite small Gothic type; then follow in Roman type forty pages of concise grammar; thirty-seven pages of miscellaneous exercises; one page each of punctuation and script; an appendix, containing sentences for translation both from and into German, pictures as suggestions for composition, ten songs, and a complete vocabulary.

The story, told in interesting yet lengthy paragraphs which might not have much appeal to the American pupil or teacher, tells of the visit of two English girls to Southern Germany, of the friendships they make there, and of their experiences. Much of the cultural life of this area is skillfully woven in, but the reviewer questions the inclusion of *Plisch und Plum*, of details of the story of *Kleider Machen Leute*, of *Der fahrende Schüler im Paradies*, and of some of the other poetry.

There would seem to be little opportunity for conversation except for what the originality of the teacher might provide. Also, it is unfortunate that the story's 20 chapters have no titles other than "Erstes Kapitel," etc, for that might have added both to interest in the book and to the ease of locating incidents in the story.

Following the story section of each chapter is a brief list of "Worte und Wendungen zum Lernen." Since this list is so limited, it is not clear to this reviewer how its content was selected. There is also a note to refer to certain grammar sections and Aufgaben later in the book. Emphasis is placed upon the customary third year high-school

grammar: passive, subjunctive, and modals, but it is sometimes difficult to see just what the relationship may be between the structure of the story and the grammar to which reference is made.

Much of the content of the book is excellent and thoroughly interesting, yet it is certain that success in its use will depend to a greater degree than usual upon the cleverness and ingenuity of the instructor who uses it.

A. HAROLD BAGG

East High School
Rochester, New York

FOGAZZARO, ANTONIO, *Piccolo Mondo Antico*, a cura di Rosa Trillo Clough e Maria Piccirilli. Milano: Edizioni Scolastiche Mondadori, 1955. Pp. 216 con 8 tavole fuori testo e una cartina geografica, Lire 1,300.

Nel presentare questa nuova e particolare edizione del "Piccolo Mondo Antico," Maria Piccirilli e Rosa Trillo Clough hanno tenuto presente la necessità degli studenti stranieri che studiano la lingua italiana. Per rendere più svelta la lettura, più vivo l'interesse per il fatto umano, hanno accorciato i passi descrittivi che nel romanzo abbondano, bellissimi passi, ma che possono essere gustati da chi conosce bene la lingua italiana e l'ambiente descritto. Ed eliminate sono state pure le espressioni dialettali, di ostica comprensione per il lettore straniero. Come conseguenza di questa riduzione la suddivisione originale dei capitoli non è stata rigidamente rispettata, così come in taluni casi sono stati sostituiti i titoli. Nessun arbitrio, comunque, da parte delle curatrici in quanto il loro scopo era quello di offrire una riduzione del romanzo "che potrà costituire un avviamento linguistico e culturale allo studio di altri grandi esempi di letteratura italiana."

Cenni storici in una premessa introduttiva, ampi esercizi di conversazione e di traduzione, svolti secondo il metodo in uso nelle scuole americane, un vocabolario delle parole usate nel romanzo e un elenco delle espressioni idiomatiche tradotte nella corrispondente forma idiomatica inglese, note in lingua inglese (mentre il testo del romanzo è in lingua italiana) una breve nota critica bio-bibliografica su Antonio Fogazzaro, costituiscono le caratteristiche principali della riduzione presentata dalle Edizioni Scolastiche Mondadori a insegnanti e studenti stranieri. Nel volume è inserita una nitida cartina geografica dei luoghi in cui si svolgono i principali avvenimenti del romanzo. L'utilità didattica di essa è così ovvia che ci esimiamo dal sottolinearla.

Del volume, però, desideriamo inoltre segnalare le otto originali tavole fuori testo ispirate a episodi del romanzo e la solida ed elegante rilegatura. Ed è come dire che estetica tipografica ed opera d'arte hanno trovato un punto di incontro.

D. M.

TURK, LAUREL H. AND ALLEN, EDITH M., *El español al día*, A Two-Year Course in High School Spanish, Second Edition. Illustrated. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1956. Book I, pp. xv+496, \$3.40. Book II, pp. xviii+379, \$3.60.

This, the second edition of *El español al día*, consists of two volumes very attractively bound, and containing a striking collection of illustrations and full-color photographs—as well as black and white photographs—of Spain and Spanish America.

The authors of *El español al día*, in the *Preface* to Book I, explain that the textbook has a dual purpose: (1) "to prepare high school students to meet college entrance requirements in foreign languages" and (2) "to provide material which is interesting and useful to students of Spanish who do not plan to continue its study in colleges and universities." Generally speaking, *El español al día* stresses the conversational approach to the Spanish language.

The lessons in Book I have been divided as follows: a) a short dialogue, followed by a vocabulary—quite conveniently placed immediately following the dialogue, and dealing with every-day situations; b) pronunciation, explained thoroughly in the first fifteen lessons; c) a group of "preguntas" to be answered in Spanish; d) grammar, with emphasis on verbs; e) exercises, with emphasis on composition; f) the section "para practicar," which provides additional exercises such as dialogues, dictations, etc.; g) in some lessons a section called "práctica"; and h) the "materias culturales," written in English. These "materias culturales" are short, factual, and stimulating.

If we consider the quantity of the material outlined in the preceding paragraph, which the authors distribute in 45 lessons, plus the nine "Repasos," which are almost as long as nine regular lessons, we must assume that there is an underlying purpose, that of presenting to the students as much Spanish as possible, and as speedily as it may be done.

Book II is the logical sequence of Book I. It is divided into two parts: the first part begins with a review that continues through lesson eight. The plan of this review, as well as that of the subsequent fifteen lessons, is essentially the same as in Book I. The dialogues of the review chapters—which deal with Spanish American history—are overly lengthy and sometimes unnatural; in lesson nine they resume the everyday topics, and therefore the easy flow of the first-year dialogues. The last three lessons deal with Spanish correspondence. A series of "Lecturas" has been inserted in the first part of Book II at three-lesson intervals, beginning with lesson three.

The second part of Book II consists of another group of "Lecturas"—including a full-length, one-act play—complete with footnotes, translation aids, and exercises. The additional sections, appendices and vocabularies, in the back of both volumes, complete the excellent, although somewhat voluminous, material in *El español al día*.

CARLOTA FOWLER

South High School,
Knoxville, Tennessee

BOLINGER, DWIGHT L., *Spanish Review Grammar*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1956, pp. xiii+257, xlv. Illustrated. Price, \$2.90.

This intermediate (second-year level) review grammar provides a wealth of factual as well as drill material, while

varying from the traditional second-year book in several respects.

Structurally, the book consists of fifteen lessons, a table of verbs, an English-Spanish vocabulary, and a very complete index. Each lesson is constructed basically the same: an exposition of the grammar illustrated with "a wealth of authoritative illustrative examples taken from Spanish-American and peninsular sources," exercises based on the grammar principles, a short Spanish original composition (of varied themes—usually light and humorous) followed by its translation into English, and exercises based on the original composition. Each composition is attractively illustrated with a drawing by the well-known artist, Shum. The book is so constructed that, if necessary, the original composition and exercises based on it may be omitted without destroying the continuity of the text.

All verb forms are presented within the first four lessons and major emphasis is placed on verb usage. However, other essential phases of the language are by no means neglected. The author reviews the basic points of grammar and also deals with those of greater difficulty which are important in spoken and written present-day Spanish, including the latest findings of linguists on points such as *quedar*, the intensive reflexive, "to become," mass nouns, and redundant pronouns. There are ingeniously-constructed, easily-interpreted tables to show not only pronouns, possessive adjectives, etc., but also noun gender, noun plurals, adjective gender, and several other items not usually given in such form. The vocabulary is practical and also extremely and unusually extensive.

There is evidence of the descriptivist in the use of such terms as "with-verb" and "with-preposition" pronoun to indicate the usual "conjunctive" and "disjunctive" pronoun. However, since the terms are descriptive, they should offer no difficulty. A technique advocated by descriptivists is commonly employed in the exercises—the principle of repetition to establish a particular language pattern.

The exercises following the grammar exposition contain usually fifty or more sentences divided into groups, each group being of the same general nature. A blank indicates either an entire sentence to be formed or an expression to be inserted in a Spanish sentence. Immediately following, there appears (in italics), the English translation of the complete sentence, thus indicating the meaning to be supplied in the blank.

The exercises following the original Spanish composition make use of the composition in a variety of ways. There are thought questions involving, e.g., meaning, word order, and relation between English and Spanish translation in the composition. Exercises based on repetition, wherein some phrase or sentence from the composition is repeated with a variation of one element—noun, adjective, verb person, verb tense, etc.—occur very frequently. There are always translations from English into Spanish, involving expressions from the composition.

The "Table of Verbs" is constructed somewhat differently from the usual one, having a sample regular verb of each conjugation completely conjugated and only the irregular forms of other verbs. A number in brackets after a verb in the text refers to the verb, or model verb, in the "Key to the Verb Tables," a part of the "Table of Verbs."

Each model verb in the "Key" is followed by the paragraph numbers of the "Table" which give the forms of that particular verb.

The general pattern of the book indicates a tremendous amount of work on the part of the author in its formulation. Each Spanish composition is very adequately supplied with footnotes providing a literal translation or explanation of an item, or a reference to the section where the grammatical principle involved is explained. The end vocabulary includes a feature which the reviewer has advocated but which (to her knowledge) appears in a book for the first time—a notation after each word indicates the chapter in which that word first appears. This information is especially useful in constructing tests. Also in the vocabulary, an aid to the student is the bracketed number following each Spanish verb referring to the "Table of Verbs."

The reviewer feels that shorter lessons may have made the book a somewhat more practical second-year text, for, in her opinion, the student must absorb too many grammatical principles and examples (on the average about ten pages) before he has opportunity to apply them in an exercise. This situation could possibly have been improved if each group of exercises covered only a portion of the principles in the chapter, rather than all of them, as it apparently does. The reviewer questions the pedagogical effectiveness of a negative statement of rule such as, e.g., p. 150—the item following (2)—"The possessive noun or pronoun . . . is used (1) to answer the question 'Which one(s)?' . . . but (2) not to answer the question 'To whom does it (do they) belong?'" In the opinion of the reviewer the text level is more that of third year; however, a well-prepared second-year class could undoubtedly handle it successfully.

On the whole, the book is very well done. For one who does not approve of a grammar and translation approach and favors a purely conversational method, the book may not have great appeal. However, for one wishing a descriptive (but not radically so) and analytical grammar approach and interested in teaching the finer and latest distinctions in usage, the book will be very valuable. It certainly deserves consideration when one is choosing a Spanish review grammar.

EVELYN E. UHRHAN

South Dakota State College

STARR, WILMARTH H., PELLEGRINO, ALFRED G., AND CASAVANT, HENRI A., *Functional Spanish*. New York: American Book Co., 1955, pp. xv and 315. \$3.25.

As the title implies, *Functional Spanish* is a practical approach to language instruction, oral statement and aural understanding receiving the primary emphasis, without, however, neglecting the development of skill in reading and writing. As essential elements in a thorough presentation, traditional grammar coverage and adequate writing practice have also been incorporated into each of the thirty lessons which comprise this competent text.

The authors, after years of classroom experiment, believe that, while not all schools can adopt an intensified program with elaborate mechanical aids, any competent teacher, with a three- or four-hours-per-week course, can

achieve substantial results by applying the principles used in this textbook. Each lesson unit includes (a) elements of speech and vocabulary; (b) model sentences; (c) grammar; (d) exercises; (e) reading and speaking. The student learns pronunciation primarily by imitating the teacher although there is also an appendix on pronunciation, mainly for reference. After the teacher has gone over with the students the material in section A, thoroughly, the latter should then be ready for section B where they learn to use the elements in A to build sentences. In relegating grammar to the third section (c) of the lesson unit, the authors demonstrate their belief that language learning is primarily repetitive and imitative, rather than being the application of theory. The exercises of section D logically recapitulate preceding material before the student undertakes the connected paragraph, final step in this method.

The authors recommend the use of supplementary readers after ten, or more, units of this text have been covered. Instructions as to procedure are given to teacher and to student in the preface, and to student also in the lessons. Two type-faces are advantageously used alternately throughout this text, one much heavier than the other. Verb-tables in the appendices are very complete. The presentation of the subjunctive, simplified to basic essentials and beginning at Lesson 10, is admirably concise and to the point. If the book has any defect, it might be the brevity of reading selections, although a supplementary reader, as recommended, would easily compensate for this. Few typographical errors were noted.

WILLIAM H. ARCHER

The Webb School
Knoxville, Tennessee

BRANLAGE, JULIA A. AND LOPES, ALBERT R., *Functional Spanish for Beginners*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1956, pp. xx+297. \$3.25.

This new grammar is aimed at teaching students to think out their ideas, to express them adequately, and to understand others. To this end the book contains introductory material (with sections on pronunciation, syllable division, stress, and breath groups and sound linking), twenty-five lessons, a quite complete verb appendix, Spanish-English and English-Spanish vocabularies, and an index. There are no maps or illustrations.

Each of the twenty-five lessons is divided as follows: vocabulary, idioms and expressions, word study and usage, construction, reading, exercises. The Keniston and Buchanan high frequency lists were the norms in building the vocabularies. The separate entries in each lesson vocabulary range from twenty-four in one lesson to thirty-eight in another. There are thirty or more entries in each vocabulary in thirteen lessons. In addition, the separate entries in the idioms and expressions section (immediately following the vocabulary) range from five to fourteen. Sixteen lessons contain eight or more entries in this section.

Examples of the amount of grammar included in the construction part of two lessons follow. In lesson six, radical-changing verbs (present tense of the three classes), indirect and direct object pronoun position, *se* to replace *le* and *les*, redundant forms for indirect object *se*, the pres-

ent tense of five irregular verbs (*tener, querer, poder, venir, decir*) are all included. And lesson thirteen teaches the preterits of radical-changing, orthographic-changing, and radical-changing-orthographic-changing verbs (present and preterit tenses), days of the week, *on* with days of the week, months of the year, dates, rate, *mil* and *millón*.

The readings were, of course, built to afford much additional practice for the student's mastery of vocabulary and construction. They do not contain any cultural background materials other than in a few scattered statements. In some of these readings there are several sentences (un-numbered) without connection or continuity all in the same paragraph. One example of this is found in the first section of number 1 on page 157. Sequence of thought and statement throughout would have accomplished the aims of the text much more quickly and thoroughly.

The exercises are abundant and varied. Each group is divided into a skill-drill section which includes several brief exercises, English sentences to be put into Spanish, and Spanish questions (ten to eighteen).

The text is in attractive format and seems to be remarkably free from typographical errors.

TERRELL LOUISE TATUM

University of Chattanooga

LUCKYJ, GEORGE S. N., *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917-1934*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956, pp. x+323. \$5.00.

Today the term Soviet literature is identified almost exclusively with Soviet Russian literature, and it is taken for granted that the literatures of the nationalities merely reflect the views of this Russian literature. Such, however, was not always the case. In the present work, one of the Studies of the Russian Institute of Columbia University, Professor Luckyj tells the story of the "unfolding and later the stifling of a national literature, through Party controls." In tracing the course of Party policy towards literature, and the extent of the resistance to this policy, he is admittedly concerned with "literary politics," with the emergence and the dissolution of literary organizations, rather than with the aesthetic evaluation of the literature of the period. He skilfully leads the reader through the intricacies of the Ukrainian literary organizations that emerged after the revolution, and indicates that for the Ukrainians, whose literary language and national aspirations had been repressed by the tsarist regime, the revolution signalled the development of a genuine literary renaissance. Symbolists, Futurists, Neoclassicists, and various groups of Proletarian writers existed side by side in the Ukraine for the first few years. However, just as in the RSFSR, in face of the exigencies of the first five-year plan, towards the end of the twenties the Party planned the destruction of those elements which were inimical to the proposed program. The chief instrument utilized by the Party for this purpose was the literary organization of the All Ukrainian Union of Proletarian Writers (VUSPP), a Ukrainian counterpart of the notorious Russian Association of Proletarian Writers (RAPP). In 1932, after they had accomplished their missions, these organizations were dissolved by the government decree abolishing all independent literary

organizations in the USSR. By the time the Union of Soviet Writers was formed in 1934, all dissonant voices had been silenced, and as Luckyj points out, "now the whole choir sang in simple unison."

This unison was achieved only at great expense to the quality of Ukrainian literature, and to the Communist Part of the Ukraine, for it involved the deliberate destruction of many Ukrainian communists—who happened to be Ukrainians first, and communists second. In July, 1933, Mykola Skrypnyk, Commissar of Education in the Ukraine from 1926 and a member of the Central Committee of the CPSU, succumbed to charges of nationalism directed against him by a Russian who had been sent to the Ukraine with special powers to supervise the economic and cultural life of that country, and committed suicide. A few months earlier, Mykola Khvylovyi, poet, short story writer, critic, and leader of the most active opposition group VAPLITE (The Free Academy of Proletarian Literature) also committed suicide. Khvylovyi wanted Ukrainian literature to develop independently of Moscow, and to be oriented towards Western European literature instead. Professor Luckyj's contention that this was not a nationalistic, but an aesthetic and literary choice, is not fully convincing and would require much more extensive documentation. Although the list of 35 important writers and 62 lesser writers who were "hamstrung or handcuffed" in the period 1930–1938 is very impressive, and does make a very strong case for Ukrainian literature, Professor Luckyj sometimes leaves one with the misleading impression that Russian writers did not have to conform to Party policy, and that Russian writers were not purged.

The work is well documented. Primary sources include Soviet publications for the period studied and considerable unpublished material, the most important being the Liubchenko Papers, personal papers of Arkadii Liubchenko, secretary of VAPLITE, who was in Kharkov when the Germans occupied that city in 1941. The author had access to such items as minutes of VAPLITE's meetings, and personal letters written by Khvylovyi and other prominent Vaplitionians. He was able to use these as a check on the official views as expounded in Soviet publications.

Of considerable value are the appendices. Full texts of Party decrees on literature, literary manifestoes and pronouncements of some literary groups, and a useful list of the leading communist officials in the Ukraine are included. The volume has an extensive bibliography, and is well indexed for easy reference.

Since the author discusses changes in the Soviet regime in the Ukraine and relates them to the Bolshevik theories of national self-determination and the national aspirations of the Ukrainians, he includes two short introductory chapters in which he discusses the revolution of 1917 in the Ukraine, and the traditions of Ukrainian literature. One chapter is concerned with Ukrainian literature, but only in so far as it is pertinent to the "literary politics" of the time. A fuller treatment would certainly have been welcomed by all who are not specialists in Soviet Ukrainian literature.

Professor Luckyj's work is especially important today because it gives us deeper insight into the mechanics of a totalitarian society where everything is forcibly directed

to a single end. In its present form, the volume is not one for the general reader, but is of considerable value to the specialist in the Soviet Union, and to all who are interested in the problems of a controlled literature.

LEON I. TWAROG

Boston University

WHATMOUGH, JOSHUA, *Language: a Modern Synthesis*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1956, pp. ix+270. Price \$4.75.

A reviewer calls this book "popular." This seems unfair to the distinguished author. He is episodic in spots, his style is brilliant and forceful, his outlook forthright. Yet this is definitely a book meant for specialists in the field of language. There is hardly an angle of that field that Professor Whatmough leaves untouched. Language is linked with all the sciences of communication, as well as with neurology, sociology, mathematics and statistics. It stands to reason that in a work of this kind some chapters are more accessible to the non-specialist than others. Particularly recommended in this connection is the chapter on "Language: Society, Individual, and Symbol." But the primary value of Whatmough's contribution is to those who have already delved, and fairly deeply, into the intricacies of linguistics.

The author's keenness of observation, however, is in evidence throughout. Starting with p. 18, where he claims that there is usually a direct relationship between the language and the culture of an ethnic group, he goes on to point out (p. 25) that the old "Classical" training was nothing but an older version of the modern "area and language" study, and that the descriptive or synchronic method (p. 110) rests upon a fiction, namely that theoretically languages may be regarded as a status, a closed, metastable system. Writing, he reminds some of his readers (p. 112) is just as valid a system of expression as talking, and a linguist's description of a language (p. 145) is of little help in learning the language; "recently published structural accounts of European languages rebut any disclaimers to this judgement."

It must be evident by this time that Professor Whatmough is endowed with what might be described as a deep and healthy skepticism for the miracle-men of modern linguistics. Speaking of recent attempts to determine the period of separation of two dialects by a statistical summary of the divergences that have occurred (the sort of thing that would put historical linguistics on the same basis as the rings in redwood trees, or the carbon in fossils), he says (p. 178): "But it must be admitted that some historically known time-depths between related dialects do not agree very well with the calculated estimates." Elsewhere on the same page he declares: "Language has never been demonstrated among the apes; speech is the prerogative of man alone."

Professor Whatmough minces no words in his judgment of Whorf and his metalinguistics, or of those who would make the use of language alone responsible for all of the world's progress and ills. To begin with, he claims that a few grammatical categories seem to be fundamental to language (p. 38), and even forecasts a logical system of grammar which will fit any pattern, ancient or modern (p. 147);

in this, perhaps, he comes close to Whorf's "Grammatical Categories" though, unlike Whorf, he does not describe his ideal system. But here the resemblance ceases: "There is a specious half-truth, but no more, in the view that meaning is controlled by the very grammatical structure of a particular language" (p. 85). "It seems more likely that in standard average European the structure of language has been made to correspond with what the speakers of it have discovered about their universe, and that what they believe about it depends not only upon the structure of the universe itself but on free inquiry. Taboo and the dead hand of tradition lead directly to where the Hopi and Navaho are." The point is reinforced on p. 186, which is a hymn to the atmosphere of freedom that gave us modern science and, in large measure, the modern languages of civilization. The earlier stages of Indo-European are described as being not too unlike those of American Indian dialects, and some of Whorf's statements are called "extraordinarily naive."

"Those who aver, erroneously, that language fashions our thought should face the question: what fashions language?" (p. 198). "There is nothing to show that concepts such as time and space have been imposed by language." (P. 225; it may be added that Hopi *rehpi* for "it flashed" and "he left on the tenth day" for "he left after ten days" are conclusively proved by Whatmough to have their parallels in Latin: pp. 47, 226.) Whatmough objects to the contrast set up by Whorf between "standard average European" physics and Hopi physics, on the ground that there is no Hopi physics (p. 227). The final conclusions about metalinguistics appear on pp. 228 and 232: "Man need not bend to linguistic circumstance, but may easily bend language to his needs" and (in paraphrase): "Language, being dynamic, may occasionally be erratic; but it is no straight-jacket."

General Semantics hardly fares any better at Whatmough's hands. Its fundamental weakness (p. 91) is that "it seeks to reduce language to the purely referential use, taking notice of its dynamic and emotive aesthetic values only to reject them." "More extensive still in popular appeal" adds Whatmough, p. 181 "—indeed this attracts also the lunatic fringe—is a somewhat naive account of language that seeks to find in it at once both the source of all human error and also the promise of universal salvation."

Professor Whatmough's work is primarily expository, but it affords him an opportunity to set forth his own linguistic philosophy. A major conclusion (p. 236) is that "there is a limit of tolerance in linguistic function; this is the notion underlying relative frequency and selective variation as the controlling factors of the use and the development of language." Another which impresses this reviewer as fundamental appears on p. 248: "Spoken language changes at a *rate* which leaves contemporaries free to communicate without disturbance; at an *intensity* which varies inversely with the ease and certainty of communication between speakers; but which is *uniform* in proportion to the degree of communication between them. . . . There is no doubt that a linguistic pattern is constantly being modified regularly, and that pattern is never wanting or destroyed."

Language, says Whatmough (p. 240) has a primary function in the organization of the world's work, in teaching

and learning, in the correction of faulty education, in giving better insight into human nature as well as into nature at large.

As in all books, there are statements in the present with which a reviewer may disagree. A few unfortunate printing errors of a misleading type occur. The table of contents lists the map of the chief languages of the world as appearing on p. 22, when actually it appears on the end-papers. In the map itself, "Spanish" is placed squarely across the only regions of South America that don't speak it: Brazil and the Guianas. Czech *r* is described (p. 192) as one of the rare phonemes which are learned last of all. It is possible that Whatmough meant Czech *ř*.

We cannot agree with the author (p. 19) that "intelligibility" supplies the distinction between language and dialect. An Italian and a Spanish speaker can understand each other better than a Piedmontese and a Sicilian speaking their respective "dialects." We frankly do not understand what Whatmough means (p. 27) when he says: "Speakers of different languages within the same political frontiers in theory were given equal recognition (e.g. Magyar in Hungary)." Is not Magyar the official and majority tongue of Hungary? "There are said to be dialects which show no *s*, but this is a most unusual state of affairs" says Whatmough (p. 37); yet not only Hawaiian, but also the Australian Aranta described by the author on p. 47 show no *s*.

Whatmough asserts (p. 38) that "most of the societies which share twentieth-century western mechanized civilization have drastically reduced their grammatical apparatus to mere remnants of irregularities," which he describes as inevitable for reasons of effectiveness. Here the author is perhaps guilty of Anglocentrism. Is not Russian a language of western mechanized civilization? And what of the extensive verb-forms of Romance, outstripping in number those of their parent-language, Latin?

"Rhyme," says Whatmough (p. 96), "is impossible in Japanese poetry since the variety of sounds permitted at the end of a word is so small that rhyme appears in any utterance, even the most prosaic, of more than two or three words." This simply is not true. Japanese words may end in practically any of the syllables of the extensive Japanese syllabary, and accidental rhyme is no more frequent in Japanese than it is, say, in Italian.

There is an inherent contradiction between p. 54: "International languages do not become operative as the result of well-meaning efforts, no matter how satisfactory in theory, on the part of linguists; or of statesmen, no matter how forceful. The use of a common language follows the course of events," and p. 65: "There are many historic examples of the formation and spread of a common language, the characteristics of which point the way to a better fashioned and better controlled language, with geographical limits not less than those of the globe itself."

Call it linguistic snobbery if you like, but I must deny Professor Whatmough's statement on p. 24: "To say that no one can call himself educated without learning a foreign language is not true. Which of us does not know more than one man or woman of deep and genuine mental and moral cultivation and development who has no language but his mother tongue?" Moral, yes; mental, not quite. The for-

eign tongue or tongues improve that "insight into human nature" which Whatmough rightly describes as one of the primary functions of language (see above). Some of the world's present woes may rightly be traced not so much to a misuse of "language" as to widespread ignorance of "languages" in high political and diplomatic spheres. This is an ignorance of which English speakers are most guilty, and it has largely redounded to the detriment of those same English speakers, as measured in terms of loss of international prestige and influence.

MARIO A. PEI

Columbia University

SMITH, HENRY LEE, JR., *Linguistic Science and the Teaching of English*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956, 61 pp. \$1.50.

Henry Lee Smith will be remembered with admiration and affection by the millions of radio listeners who used to tune in on his program "Where Are You From?", in the course of which he would face persons unknown to him, listen to their pronunciation of a list of key words, and then almost unerringly localize their places of origin in the United States within a radius of fifty miles or less. This he did through his deep knowledge of American English isoglosses, those imaginary boundary lines for local pronunciations.

In the current work, which is an amplification of an Inglis lecture given at Harvard, the author, for many years a linguistic consultant for the Foreign Service of the State Department and associated with the Georgetown University School of Linguistics, offers a fascinating summary of his methodology for the study of American English pronunciation, intonation and stress patterns, and presents a few considerations concerning their possible application both in the teaching of English and that of foreign languages.

Concerning their usefulness in the latter field, there is no doubt in this reviewer's mind. A student who has been trained to recognize not merely English sounds, but also English patterns of intonation and stress, will at once be able to recognize the differences he encounters in the patterns of another language and circumvent their difficulties. It is a proved fact that French, German, or any other foreign tongue may be spoken with phonetic correctness and yet sound completely foreign when its intonation and stress systems are overlooked.

For what concerns the application of the author's methodology to the study of English, particularly in the lower grades, there are legitimate reservations. If it is true, as the author alleges (p. 9), that by the age of 5½ the normal individual has gained full control, out of awareness, or by force of habit, of the patterns of his own speech, is there not the danger that by arousing his consciousness we may throw him into confusion, and lead him to speak unnaturally? The charge has often been voiced against those

who endeavor to make their students grammar-conscious that this process leads to a distortion of natural speech-habits. Intonation and stress are even more delicate than grammar. Their analysis should perhaps be reserved for the college level.

The author's presentation is at its best when he describes his own specialty. Elsewhere, particularly at the beginning of the book, where he endeavors to convert his readers to metalinguistics and what he calls "culturology" (a bad hybrid, incidentally), there is an abundance of gobbledegook. "Configured events" are "structured" (p. 5-6); systems are "internalized" (p. 8). Logic is "an extrapolation of the basic categories inherent in linguistic structure" (p. 10). There is a "reemphasizing of the content of what is learned in reference to the matrix in which it is presented" (p. 11). The linguist's job is "to analyze and describe the structure of language on ascending levels of complexity" (p. 13). Language is "composed of isolates, sets and patterns" (p. 13). We have been "enculturated as Americans" (p. 55). Best of all, however, is the "double-cross juncture," something that occurs when there is a gradual diminution of intensity until silence is reached (p. 50).

The assertion that French entirely lacks a stress system for words is misleading (p. 41). On both syntactical and pedagogical grounds, we object to the statement (p. 8) that "even our best and most forward-looking educators seem to be operating on the assumption *that* since the child can't read when he comes to school, *that* he must be taught his language" (italics ours).

Pedagogically speaking, Smith and his school do not seem to think too highly of the English teacher's attempt to teach the students how to read, write and spell, since to them speaking is the paramount function of language. They do not want the teacher to "correct" gross localisms in pronunciation, like *pen* and *pin* pronounced alike in parts of the South (p. 35). The same point of view is applied by them (though not in this work) to substandard features of speech. This leaves little for the teacher of English as a native language to do, save to insist upon the "facts" of language—phonology, intonation, stress, etc. But since these "facts" are subject to great local and personal fluctuation, both teacher and students are left somewhat up in the air.

Perhaps, in these days when everything else is becoming standardized, linguistic scientists ought to give a little thought to the problem of the standardization of the English language, and the desirability of giving it some measure both of spoken and of written (or spelling) regularity, so that it may cease to be the crazy-quilt that it is and acquire the relative stability that appears in other languages, in which you can speak and even write poetry in all the dialects you want, but where there is also a standard form capable of acting as a point of reference for both natives and foreigners.

MARIO A. PEI

Columbia University

* * *

A blow with a word strikes deeper than a blow with a sword.

—ROBERT BURTON

* * *